



This page has been archived and is no longer updated

[Find out more about page archiving.](#)

# NEWS

## The Editors

[« Previous](#) | [Main](#) | [Next »](#)[Jump to main content](#)

### 9/11 conspiracy theory



Steve Herrmann | 11:33 UK time, Friday, 27 October 2006

[Comments](#)

A five-year-old story from our archive has been the subject of some recent editorial discussion here. The story, written in the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, was about confusion at the time surrounding the names and identities of some of the hijackers. This confusion was widely reported and was also acknowledged by the FBI.



The story has been cited ever since by some as evidence that the 9/11 attacks were part of a US government conspiracy.

We later reported on the list of hijackers, thereby superseding the earlier report. In the intervening years we have also reported in detail on the investigation into the attacks, the 9/11 commission and its report.

We've carried the full report, executive summary and main findings and, as part of the recent fifth anniversary coverage, a detailed guide to what's known about what happened on the day. But conspiracy theories have persisted. The confusion over names and identities we reported back in 2001 may have arisen because these were common Arabic and Islamic names.



In an effort to make this clearer, we have made one small change to the original story. Under the FBI picture of Waleed al Shehri we have added the words "A man called Waleed Al Shehri..." to make it as clear as possible that there was confusion over the identity. The rest of the story remains as it was in the archive as a record of the situation at the time.

We recently asked the FBI for a statement, and this is, as things stand, the closest thing we have to a definitive view: **The FBI is confident that it has positively identified the nineteen hijackers responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Also, the 9/11 investigation was thoroughly reviewed by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States and the House and Senate Joint Inquiry. Neither of these reviews ever raised the issue of doubt about the identity of the nineteen hijackers.**

#### Comments

1.

At 01:11 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

SKA wrote:

I don't think archived stories should ever be edited. If it's very important to clarify something, a short notice in italic should be added on the top of the article instead. This notice must be very precise in describing what clarification that needs to be done.

#### About this blog

Welcome to The Editors blog. We are a group of BBC editors from across the corporation who blog about our dilemmas and decisions, and our passion for journalism. We are not afraid to take a stand, and we encourage our readers to do the same. We are not afraid to take a stand, and we encourage our readers to do the same.

For the latest updates from the BBC Blogs, visit the [Blogs homepage](#).

You can find details of our [Guidelines](#) here.

#### Subscribe to The Editors

You can stay up to date with our posts via these feeds.

- [The Editors Feed](#)
- [The Editors Feed](#)

If you aren't sure what to do, check out our [beginner's guide](#).

#### Elsewhere at the BBC



**Newswatch:** Click on the image to read the latest news from the BBC's international news service.

- BBC Internet Blog
- About the BBC
- Radio 4 blog
- 5 live blog
- TV Blog

#### Other news blogs

- [News Editors](#)

2.

At 01:11 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Ben wrote:

Im sorry...which conspiracy theory was cleared up here?

None that I can see.

Double think is strong in most people.

The acceptance that the general population has been systematically lied too is far too great a notion for most people to take on board lightly....hence the resistance to "conspiracy theories".

Order a copy of Webster Tarpley's Synthetic Terror for a much clearer understanding of events on 9/11.

You can buy it on amazon.

3.

At 01:19 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

lester wrote:

WE ARE ALL LIVING IN A CONSPIRACY. IT IS FORCED ON US BY POLITICIANS, CIVIL SERVANTS, FINANCIERS AND INSURANCE COMPANIES. WE ARE TOLD THAT TO COMPLAIN IS WRONG BUT WE ARE ALL ON THE SAME PLANET WHICH HAS A MIND OF ITS OWN. WE WILL NEVER CHANGE THAT WHICH IS INEVITABLE NOR WILL WE EFFECT WHAT WILL BE BY THE CURRENT FORMAT WHICH WILL CONTINUE TO ENTERTAIN THEM WHILE THE REST OF US SUFFER WITH THEIR SYSTEM. IT IS IMPORTANT TO THEM THAT WE SUPPLY THAT WHAT THEY NEED WHILE STARVING AND DYING FROM MISUSE OF THEIR POWER. WHAT CAN HAPPEN IS A REVOLUTION AND THOSE IN PARANOIA POWER WILL ALWAYS CONSPIRE TO MAKE US PAY EITHER IN BLOOD OR THROUGH OUR CONSTANT SEARCH TO FOLLOW THE JONES FAMILY. WELL THE REALITY IS THAT THEY WERE BANKRUPTED YEARS AGO AND THIS SYSTEM WILL NOT REST UNTIL WE ARE ALL AS MORALLY AND FINANCIALLY BANKRUPT AS THEY ARE. CALL THIS A DEMOCRACY, THAT ENTAILS INPUT FROM ALL SO WHY CANT WE TALK TO OUR MP, OR VISIT OUR PRIME MINISTER?. BECAUSE THEY HAVE THEIR CONSPIRACY AND THEY ARE AFRAID OF BEING FOUND OUT AND THAT IS WHY THEY DENY AND DEMONISE THOSE WHO SEEK CHANGE. IT STARTED WITH GOOD INTENTIONS AND WAS CORRUPTED BY THEIR FEAR CREATING SYSTEM. THIS IS WHY WE NEED TO BE CREATIVE AND NOT STIFFLED BY THEIR DENIALS OF ITS EXISTENCE. THIS IS THE REAL CONSPIRACY NOT THE RELIGEOUS BUT POLITICAL NEED TO SURVIVE. WE WILL CONTINUE TO PAY THESE OVERPAID MORONS WHILE THEY KILL US. THE WORLD IS OVERPOPULATED WITH MIDDLEMEN ALL SEEKING TO UP RATE THEIR PENSIONS WHILE ROBBING THOSE THAT FEED THEIR FAMILY.

4.

At 01:22 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Marko wrote:

You do have to realize that anything american media and governemnt says in the aftermath of the botched up investigation will only make people believe them less.

5.

At 01:22 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Pancha Chandra wrote:

These nineteen hijackers were deranged individuals who were obviously brainwashed. Our mind boggles when we realise the extent they were prepared to go and their infamy and their callous disregard for the sanctity of human life. Obviously they used religion as a garb for their extreme hatred of America. Let us hope we never see such blatant hate ever enacted again.

6.

- Sport Editors

- Journalism Labs

- BBC Internet Bl

- Radio 4 Blog

- Peston's Picks

- Nick Robinson's

- Stephanomics

- Mark Easton's L

- Mark Mardell's ,

- Nick Bryant's Ai

- Andrew Harding

- Gavin Hewitt's I

- Soutik Biswas' ]

- dot.Rory

- Science: Jonah

- Richard Black o

- Today: Tom Feil

- Fergus Walsh's

- Newsnight: Pau

- Newsnight: Mar

- Torin Douglas

- Will Gompertz's

- Phil Coomes on

- Magazine Monit

- Mark D'Arcy in '

- NI: Mark Dever

- Scotland: Brian

- Scotland: Doug

- Wales: Betsan F

- Martin Rosenba

- 5 Live Breakfas

- Newsnight

- PM programme

- World Tonight:

At 01:29 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Ray wrote:

The only comment I want to make is that there isn't much in a name. The fact remains that at least 6 of the 19 "hijackers" were and are alive, (according to BBC reports by the way). Even if they were not, it would not matter because there is much bigger and much more solid evidence that 9/11 was an inside job. Please read books by David Ray Griffin and Jim Marrs; those are some of the best books I have ever read. Please use your own minds instead of being spoonfed by CNN and other government owned media. The building s could not have come down due to fire; it was impossible. I am not saying that, experts and eye-witnesses are. They were brought down using explosives unless the laws of physics stopped being true that day! An airliner DID NOT hit the pentagon; if it did, how come we never saw even one part of it? Flight 93 did not crash cause of the passengers, it was shot down, according to the US Airforce pilots who talked about it to media, but of course you never will see those reports on national TV! Just do your own research and you'd know too just like I do. I know it is very hard to believe all this; it was for me too! I never believe things blindly even religious things but the evidence is there whether you care to see it or not! Those (like me) who care to do their own research, and investigate the truth for themselves, know better . Just think, would you not want to know that what the government is telling you was REALLY true had your kid died on 9/11?

7.

At 01:32 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Henry edward Hardy wrote:

This column is really most unsatisfying. It seems to be political spin. Real journalism would be to further investigate the issues raised. For instance, who are the men you pictured in the article? What is their current status?

Changing the photo caption at this late date seems to be inappropriate. This redaction of a historical and controversial news article smacks of Big Brother and the Ministry of Truth.

If the BBC was mistaken, then the mistakes must be acknowledged and corrected in a less elliptical fashion. There must be accountability. On the other hand, if the BBC article might be correct, to the points on which this might contradict the official record in the US, the matter would then require further investigation and explication in the public interest.

HENRY EDWARD HARDY

Ann Arbor, MI

8.

At 01:37 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Albert wrote:

In the aftermath of 9/11, the FBI had little or no access to fundamental information regarding the event.

As we know, Saudis were flown out of the country and evidence from Ground Zero was removed before your typical CSI-scientific analysis was carried out. Pretty interesting for a crime scene under federal jurisdiction?

What supports conspiracy theorists is the blatant lack of transparency and the bullish intervention of the executive branch.

People have doubts and caption rewriting will probably not do the trick.

9.

At 02:07 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Sean wrote:

This does raise some interesting questions about going back and editing stories after their publication - not just from a journalistic accuracy point of view but from a web publishing POV too...

Personally I'm always loathe to re-write the past... I'm not saying this is something that's happened here, but the more cynical out there could point to it as an example of precedent setting.

It's good that the amendment has been recorded publicly, and the reasons behind it. I do hope any other changes made are reflected clearly so no one can say the BBC is re-writing stories.

10.

At 02:32 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Noddy wrote:

Errrr what point are you're trying to make??? Or are you just taking yet another pop at the Americans.

11.

At 02:41 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

HNeilH wrote:

Still, one must admit the skills required to accurately fly the aircraft as they did, were sorely lacking with all of the hijackers. Above all else however, are the events and visual aftermath at the pentagon. It baffles any explanation.

12.

At 02:42 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Ken Wieczerza wrote:

As an avid BBC reader in the U.S., I am deeply disappointed to see this kind of story put on the front of your "Americas" section. It is yet another in a long line of misleading stories and features from mainstream media that seek to dissuade attention from the cold, hard facts of the 9.11 truth movement (and to be sure, it certainly is worthy of the "movement" moniker).

First of all, the FBI has never formally charged any of these people - the hijackers, bin Laden, and many others - in the 9.11 attacks. Furthermore, there is significant evidence to indicate that several of the supposed hijackers are actually alive and well in the Middle East. Finally, and most importantly, this hijacker-identity theory is a small and relatively unsubstantiated claim made by a few in the 9.11 truth community, and is certainly of far less importance than the irrefutable and well-documented evidence of a false flag operation.

The implosion of all three WTC towers that fell that day (at near free-fall speed, mind you), including building 7, which had both no reason to be on fire and no reason to implode into a tidy pile of rubble at 5:20 pm, is perhaps the clearest evidence. The story of WTC building 1 custodian William Rodriguez, who saved a man who had been burned by an explosion on sub-level 6 (underground) seconds before the first plane hit, is another. The most startling, however, is all there, for people to see, on film. President Bush's own account of his whereabouts when the strikes occurred is a chilling admission of guilt. In 2002, while speaking in Florida, Mr. Bush recounted his experiences at the elementary school that day. To his memory, he had seen the first strike on television, which would have been impossible since that footage did not become available until 9.12.01. What's more, an aide told Peter Jennings on the morning of 9.11 that Andrew Card had told the president about the first plane on the way out of his hotel, further indicating that his story and reactions to the "news" were fabricated. In his Florida speech, Bush nearly gave it all away, saying "Well Andy Card (pause)...actually I was in a schoolroom...and I saw it, there was a TV on, obviously...". This is not fiction, people can look it up freely.

These factors, in addition to the bizarre coincidence of major tactical air defense war games on that day and the mysterious short-sell trading on shares of American Airlines and United directly prior to that date make it clear that we at least deserve an independent and honest investigation into the attacks, not some \$15 million whimper from the government. (Clinton scandal investigation tab = \$40 million).

Please, don't fall into the same mix as the New York Times and the Washington Post. The mainstream media continually ignores these blinding facts and seeks to distract attention from them. We here in the States expect better from the BBC.

13.

At 03:21 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

jake wrote:

Both sides offer a lot of evidence. The governments evidence always seeming more convincing. This however is unlikely to change anyone's mind.

14.

At 03:29 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

John wrote:

It's funny that the BBC would run this article. It's absolutely IMPOSSIBLE that September 11 happened the way the US government says it did. Period. Why don't you try to find out what actually happened? THAT would be journalism...

15.

At 03:32 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

DTS wrote:

Really? Why do you apology for telling the truth? Wonder if one day you will also "retouch" the picture to fit better into the **Official Conspiracy Theory**. Those tin foil hat busheviks from Popular Mechanics (with strong ties to the CIA) claimed to have DNA evidence of the hijackers, but they never produced anything when recently challenged in public. Will you? Come on! The FBI "statement" is contradictory of what its own director has been telling (babbling) us for the past five years. Now, tell me, WHO is the conspirator ...

16.

At 03:37 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

JP Campbell wrote:

Steve,

I understand why you felt the need to make this clarification but as reply 1 indicates I fear this thread is doomed to become a honeypot for nut jobs, cranks and other assorted conspiracy theorists.

Personally I think the whole thing was cooked up by Shergar and Lord Lucan. And the Pentagon wasn't hit by a plane. It was a small white car driven by a man in the pay of the French secret service.

17.

At 03:41 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Philgates wrote:

Get a life Steve. Everyone knows 911 was an inside job.

18.

At 03:58 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Ron Williams wrote:

Yes - I too am surprised that the BBC would give breathing space to the crackpot conspiracy theories vis-à-vis the 911 plot.

USA big government is largely incapable of organizing anything well without a long gestation period - so how was President Bush able to craft an intricate plan such as the 911 in the first few days of his presidency (circa Jan to Sept 2001), and further, remember, he had almost no experience then of how central government worked. And that bit hasn't changed, truth to tell.

I recommend the conspiracy theorists go and back and sharpen their pencils on the JFK conspiracy which surely has sufficient mileage still in it.

No! the real culprits with regard to 911 were incompetence at all levels and turf wars

within the USA security system And I doubt that has changed either.  
Ron, Colorado, USA

19.

At 04:14 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

david wrote:

It is interesting. I started reading "1984" and the main male character was a re-editor of newspapers stories to make past news fit the official Government line for its own purposes.

9/11 was an inside job. Not only do I recommend "9/11 Synthetic terror", I also recommend "The War on Truth" by Nafeez Ahmed.

20.

At 04:18 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

David wrote:

All the BBC does is report the news, why don't you actually try investigating these events for a change instead of mindlessly regurgitating 'facts' provided to you by the Bush administration and the 9/11 (omission) Commission?

Why is it that I am able to find more indepth analysis of what actually happened on that terrible 9/11 day through web sites that are run on not even a tenth of the budget that BBC has, for example: prison planet.com?

Shame on the BBC for its lack of thorough investigative journalism!

21.

At 04:23 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Mo wrote:

I'm glad there are so many people who have done their own independent research and who have questions. The question that remain unanswered.

Instigating hatred for a particular religion (Islam) and for particular part of the world (middle east) was one of the main reasons for 911. Since 911, governments have gotten full approval from people to go and kill as many innocent Muslims as possible and after killing them, label their dead bodies as terrorists.

Main Stream media played a very important role and sadly BBC is not innocent. The result of so many lies is the ignorance and fear among people in west. A shocking example is that when a wedding in Afghanistan was bombed by the US, my girlfriend's father had this to say "Nice, kill'em all". Without any doubt he's a republican and a bush supporter.

For Mr. Steve Herrmann I'm sure you could do better than that !

22.

At 04:32 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Peter Jakobsson wrote:

Given that you were prepared to go to great lengths to state how 'murky' and 'short on detail' the FBI briefings were in your 5th October report, why has the BBC not been prepared to report more substantially on events which have seriously challenged the official account of tha day ?

Pakistan's Chief Spy General Mahmoud Ahmad wiring money to Atta ? Identical collapse of a 3rd building on the same day ? Research into the possibility of controlled demolition ? Continually changing story as to why planes were not intercepted ? Alleged hijackers complete lack of flying skills ? Norman Mineta testimony ? Manipulation of intelligence to get us into pre-emptive wars ?

The BBC is largely responsible for fixing the (unsubstantiated) 'official conspiracy theory' in the minds of millions. It has a responsibility to review it's coverage now that that so much of this fairy tale has been shown to be demonstrably false.

23.

At 05:14 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

JoMama wrote:

I see the "religionists" are here posting. They don't need evidence, they believe what they want to believe. America is evil, therefore, it must have killed its own citizens on 9/11. There is no evidence to bolster this nonsense, but to them, none is needed. They just "know" and they seize on any anomaly and announce it is proof.

No one has showed that 6 of 19 hijackers are alive. There may be other people who have the same names and that is all that such a news report would prove. Of course, to the religionists, none of this matters.

There is a strain of Islam that is bent on mass murder and they carried it out on 9/11 and more want to do the same. This doesn't mean every response from the Americans (or the west) is justified (invading Iraq was not). However, these ridiculous conspiracy theories are just a diversion from real issues.

24.

At 05:34 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Peter wrote:

Steve: Was it the purpose of this "Comment" to use one insignificant & isolated item as a rebuttal of all conspiracy theories? If so, it tends to make me yawn! In any event, the subject matter has no "meat".

There's plenty to go on, obviously...Too many inconsistencies, inadequate investigations, implausibilities...AND, there are far too many proven conspiracies to assume this isn't one/ Simply check history.

25.

At 05:34 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

briav wrote:

How absurd that anybody could have ever believed that a man in a cave in Afghanistan and physics defying muslim hijackers could turn Manhattan into a sea of particle dust. Who needs nuclear weapons? Just ram a couple of old airplanes into Slough and watch it turn to dust.

The BBC are "ACCESSORIES AFTER THE FACT" in this most heinous of crimes. They actively participated in covering it up. When push comes to shove, I hope they are in the dock also.

26.

At 05:35 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Robert Bickers wrote:

Why is it so hard to believe that foreign nationals allied against the US managed to demolish a major symbol of American capitalism? The towers' fall *clearly* occurred due to the extreme damage caused by burning jet fuel and sheared supports severed by the planes' impact. The only conspiracy was the one concocted by a small group of men irate at the US for some reason.

Scientific analysis has *conclusively* proven that the planes brought down the towers. Why can so few people seem to realize that? Hatred of the American government should never nullify empirical evidence.

As to the revision of the caption: it does nothing to ease the allegations of governmental malfeasance, it only makes the BBC feel better. But at least you told us.

27.

At 05:45 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Justin wrote:

Thank you for writing this! I've been getting tired of all of the nonsense-spewing conspiracy theories out there. They display a complete ignorance of science and dismiss

any evidence to the contrary, saying it was fabricated, or simply pretending it doesn't exist.

For more, see here:

<https://www.loosechangeguide.com>

28.

At 05:45 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

J.G. wrote:

Why the problem with 'stealth edits' all of a sudden. the BBC often changes its stories without changing the time stamp at the top. Check out BBBC or LGF for many examples.

29.

At 05:52 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Adam wrote:

David wants to know --- Why don't you see the BBC reporting the stuff you see on those fly-by-night website?

Well, it \*could\* be that the BBC has some standards regarding the info they publish.

Hey, I just made a website that reports that Aliens Kidnapped Princess Di and mated her with Elvis.

The major news sources have ignored this startling revelation, so obviously they're hiding something, right???

30.

At 05:55 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Ben wrote:

I am dismayed at this flimsy article, it's hardly an editorial masterpiece is it. Its about time the mainstream media picked up on this movement and stopped regurgitating information provided by the FBI and the US Government. People need to read books such as Webster Tarpley's Synthetic Terror which recently won the acclaim of an ex-cia and high ranking ex-marine Robert Steele. Bring back investigative journalism instead of just commenting on Bush's "stupidity", he knows exactly what he's up to.

31.

At 05:56 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

James wrote:

Haha, the continuous anti-BBC comments in these blogs all become clear - you're a bunch of conspiracy freaks.

# Ray 01:29 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Try putting down your copy of Loose Change, and maybe investigate the fundamental flaws in their argument, missquotes and irrelevant information?

32.

At 06:00 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Steve wrote:

I love it when the news becomes the news.

33.

At 06:03 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Craig Beaton wrote:

I'd love to see the BBC really look into the 9/11 bombings and investigate the theories as to what really happened. There is so much about it that is far too fishy to be believed.

What I can't figure out is why everyone seems so scared of doing so. Perhaps we are scared of finding out what we already know that even in the 'free democratic west' we

can't trust our own governments.

34.

At **06:10 PM** on 27 Oct 2006,

george wrote:

I cannot believe what some people are writing as gospel truth, inciting a false belief in a conspiracy that simply does not exist. It is tantamount to arguing that 2+2 is not equal to 4. These conspiracies have been thoroughly de-bunked in many venues and countries.

Why anyone would still believe in them boggles the rational mind.

35.

At **06:16 PM** on 27 Oct 2006,

Mark wrote:

Everyone likes a good conspiracy story but it is amazing how many people get facts and fiction confused especially when they'd prefer to blame a crime on someone they don't like, the US government, Israel, or someone else. All of the hard evidence put before the public from facts about the known hijackers to the video taped confession of Osama Bin Laden himself makes it clear beyond reasonable doubt that Al Qaeda planned and committed the crime. Whether we know their correct names or not, all of those who were on the planes doing the actual hijacking are dead. Some who helped them by plotting and abetting are still alive and free including Bin Laden. Conspiracy lovers can pick apart every one of the countless inevitable loose threads they can find in a long complicated sequence of events and their aftermath trying to pull the tapestry apart but what remains always gives the same picture. I think deep down most people have little real doubt who committed the crimes or why, even if they don't like it.

36.

At **06:22 PM** on 27 Oct 2006,

Christopher Stutts wrote:

I saw the smoke from the Pentagon from a building in McLean, Virginia. Regarding the statement that "An airliner DID NOT hit the pentagon": A close friend driving on highway I-395 north (toward DC and the Pentagon) did see a large plane fly fast and low over him immediately before the Pentagon explosion. A neighbor of mine heard the large explosion from several miles away. If that plane did not hit the Pentagon, where did it go? (Please don't say the river. Look up stories of the DC Air Florida crash.)

There is a story that the airliner was shot down by the F-16 which arrived on the scene from southern Virginia. One needs to look at actual eyewitness accounts of the F-16 arrival (from Langley AFB I think, not the much closer Andrews AFB which didn't host fighter jets) to hold an informed opinion. But best anyone here can figure, an aluminum-skinned 757 full of fuel struck the Pentagon and burned up.

37.

At **06:24 PM** on 27 Oct 2006,

David Stevenson wrote:

Heheheheheheh3ehehhehehehehehehehheehheehhehehehheh

HAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH,

side splitting comments here, I want to seeee these people commenting, hehehehehe, are ...they serious---YES---sane????

hehehehe.

David (now im part of the C-O-N ummm spiracy)

38.

At **06:29 PM** on 27 Oct 2006,

John R. McIntee wrote:

With all due respect to those opinions posted here, as a pilot and aviation professional for

over 25 years I would like to comment on certain statements.

The collapse of the towers was caused by the fuel fire. Jet fuel burns in excess of 1400F, and melted the structural steel. When it failed, gravity and mass inertia finished them.

With respect to Flight 93, the public record is pretty clear that the aircraft rolled into the ground from a low altitude due to loss of control on the flight deck. The Flight Data Recorder and Cockpit Voice Recorder support the conclusion that there was a fight for control of the machine on the flight deck. If the machine had been at a higher altitude, they might have been successful.

The skill necessary to guide a 767 into a tall standing structure requires no more than the turn of a small knob on a screen to change the aircraft's direction of flight and turn of another to change its altitude. It would take me about 10 minutes to show any of you who are contributing to this blog how to complete the manoeuvres that the hijackers did that day. Today's airliners are highly self-sufficient, and once in the air you need only to change what is called the Heading Bug to point the aircraft where you want, push the throttles forward to increase your speed, and the objective is accomplished. Skill is required for takeoff and landing, not level flight.

The Pentagon strike is an anomaly to me. Having seen the aftermath of two crashes, the lack of any baggage, seats, debris, etc., leads me to believe that something other than an airliner struck that building. If the force of impact was such that the structure of the aircraft was "vaporized", the mass of a B-757 moving at such a speed would have obliterated the building. One needs only to review the video of the DC-10 that crashed at Sioux City to arrive at the same conclusion. Of particular interest is the absence of the engines. Aircraft engines are subjected to tests during certification prior to installation on airliners that would have exceeded the forces brought to bear on them had they struck the building. They are designed to shear off of the wings at impact, and the containment vessel -which protects the aircraft from explosions within the turbine section - would, without a doubt, have survived the crash and would have been clearly evident outside of the building.

Something hit the Pentagon - no doubt about that. I can only speculate that whatever it was, it was something that no-one wants to admit had fallen into the hands of the "bad guys", whoever they are.

39.

At 06:43 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Tony Watts wrote:

The vast majority of responses to this blog appear to support an anti-American 9/11 conspiracy stand point. Some of these people even claim to have researched their theories fully. I think not. To these people I address the following. Don't knock the American people, don't give succour to the enemies of western civilisation. Bin Laden and his supports are laughing fit to bust with your anti US Government rubbish. If you want to further your research have a look at Popular Mechanics exhaustive report called "Debunking The 9/11 Myths - Mar. 2005 Cover Story" url ://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military\_law/1227842.html

I'm no expert, your no expert, put your petty prejudices to one side for a moment and read.

40.

At 06:50 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Tom Paine wrote:

"He who controls the present controls the past. He who controls the past controls the future."

George Orwell

This column does not address the very real questions raised by so-called conspiracy theories, nor (to the best of my knowledge) have these questions ever been seriously addressed by the BBC, or by the 911 Commission either, for that matter. A list of these questions is readily compiled just from the comments of other readers. To summarize the most obvious questions:

- 1) Why did all three towers collapse at near-freefall speed?
- 2) Why did WT7 collapse at all?
- 3) Where is the jet wreckage on the Pentagon lawn?
- 4) Why is the hole in the Pentagon wall so much smaller than a 757?

Just for starters...

41.

At 07:27 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Moriae Encomium wrote:

That case should be reopened, and independent investigation of all 911 events should take place. This guessing game is ridiculous; there is perfect CCTV installed at Pentagon, release those footage and video streams. Those unclaimed put options? You cannot put, put options anonymously, release that info... progressive (pancake) theory? Dear God, what is that? Freefall? Perhaps you (BBC) should take a look at your own guidelines or add some new ones, about such things as POV, NPOV, or how to stay unbiased.

42.

At 07:35 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Sanne aka swinferno wrote:

Dear BBC,

You were renowned around the world for your objective reporting. This is your chance to maintain and extend your reputation: EXPOSE THE MANY MANY LIES THAT ARE IN THE OFFICIAL STORY.

Like the people above me have stated, the evidence that the theories put forth by the US government is incorrect is abundant. If you wish to save your name, your nation, the Western Civilization, The World, this is your chance. You will not get another opportunity. If you fail....well....

Yours sincerely,  
Sanne

43.

At 07:46 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Don Matthews wrote:

Mr. Herrmann,

I read your recent blog on "9/11 conspiracy theory" and have a question for you and your science staff.

Would you be so kind as to explain to me how jet fuel can weaken reinforced steel buildings to the point of collapse and completely incinerate aircraft and their contents?

I ask the question because I have heard various explanations for 9/11 and will not allow myself to draw any conclusions until I scrutinize the facts.

This single fact seems to be pivotal to many explanations and I have great faith in the veracity of the Periodic Table.

If you and your esteemed team could explain these alleged facts, I am sure it would be of significant interest to your readers.

Thank you sincerely.

Don

44.

At 07:48 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Azazel wrote:

Glad to see that people don't buy into this bull anymore. Guess you can only hide the truth for so long.

Turn the power to the have-nots...

[www.universalseed.org](http://www.universalseed.org)

45.

At 07:55 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Chander wrote:

Editing the past? Wasn't that the job of the unhappy Mr. Winston in Orwell's "1984"?

Orwell, who once worked for the BBC is said to have weaved some of his experiences at "the BEEB" into his dystopic novel.

You have a chance to redeem yourselves however. To do that you will have to stop blindly parroting the official myth of 9/11.

There are clues all over the 9/11 Crime of the Century. Get out there and start following up on them!

It is startlingly obvious that the World Trade Center's collapses were controlled demolitions. It had to be an inside job. Help expose this terrible truth and you will set the standard for courage in journalism for untold generations to come. Continue with aiding in the cover-up and you will be relegated to the dustbin of history.

46.

At 08:01 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Susan Kipping wrote:

Watch "Loose Change" at [www.loosechange911.com](http://www.loosechange911.com) also "9/11 Press for Truth" the coverup exposed by the 9/11 families at [www.911PressForTruth.com](http://www.911PressForTruth.com) . You should ask questions and find the answers. We must know the truth.

I would like the truth about September 11 exposed. The U.S. media never investigated this tragic day. I sat in front of the T.V. after the Pentagon was hit. There was no airliner in or around that building. The grass was not even touched, still green. The hole was too small. I first heard that a truck bomb had gone off, then that info was updated to an airliner hitting the Pentagon. Do you realize the training it would take to master such a feat as to turn a huge jetliner around from that angle, hitting the only area of the building that was being remodeled?

Later that day building seven fell in a free fall and it wasn't even hit. Mayor Giuliani had just spent \$13 million to refurbish an entire floor for a command center. Destroyed in that building were FBI, CIA, Wall Street info, etc...

The U.S. Air force was told to stand down while all these planes are flying around known to be hijacked. Why? The day before 9/11 there was advanced trading on Wall Street regarding stocks from both airlines involved. Someone made a lot of money. Within hours of the attacks George Bush has the list of known terrorist and none of their names were on the passenger lists. How did he know so quickly?

We in America have questions. Our constitution is being taken apart. The veil of secrecy is stifling. If you ask questions, you are threatened. Our elections are rigged. Our voices are not heard. Our national treasury is being robbed. We are in an endless war making the rich richer. I ask those around the world to support us in asking questions and

investigating this tragic event. It affects us all.

47.

At 08:17 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Chris wrote:

I appreciated you typing your definitive view in bold letters. It made a nice change from seeing regular unbold letters.

48.

At 08:23 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Peter Bingham wrote:

There are several problems with the comments here. First, I will say that it is good to be skeptical, especially of the Bush administration, but those in the 9/11 movement are using arguments and relying on experts in the same way people dismiss global warming.

One of the accusations in the comments to the story claims that many of the hijackers turned up alive and well, which is exactly what the BBC update intended to disprove.

There were cases of mistaken identities for mistaken identities. You can't disprove Mr. Herrmann's article using the very same stories that the article admits were flawed.

Another accusation floated above is that the Pentagon was not hit by American Airlines Flight 77. If not, then what happened to the passengers, including Barbara Olson, wife of Theodore Olson, one of George Bush's biggest supporters and no doubt someone who would be in on any big conspiracy. Not a single conspiracy theorist has come up with an explanation for the missing passengers, and so as a consequence they don't even bring it up.

Lastly, using experts to disprove the fires started the collapse of the WTC is akin to using experts to prove that global warming does not exist. A very small minority of scientists and engineers believe the buildings were demolished, just as a very small minority of scientists believe that global warming is either a hoax or no threat to the world.

Thank you, BBC, for giving the conspiracy theorists one less ridiculous assertion to float around.

49.

At 08:29 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

O.Singh wrote:

9/11 was the day first time in the history of aviation two airliners evaporated with out leaving a trace. And one whole Airliner went through a hole about 12 feet in diametre. Please leave the matter in the hands of relatives of the victims. You probably were not in New York on the fifth anniversary of 9/11, My neice about 5000 of them and they want an honest investigation which is not forthcoming. Please leave the matter in their hands they will find out the real truth sooner or later. Respectfully Mr. Singh

50.

At 08:34 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Edward Rynearson wrote:

The FBI claims that all hijackers were identified using DNA matching. If you want to listen to Popular Mechanic's researcher Davin Coburn get taken apart at the hinges when asked a simple question by Charles Goyette, a popular Arizona drive time talk show host, please visit <https://www.truthcult.com>. There is an excerpt of the interview you can listen to that should raise your eyebrows.

51.

At 08:37 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Sam wrote:

I don't believe for a second that the attacks on the twin towers were a legitimate terrorist

attack but i think the attack on the Pentagon to be slightly suspiceous.

Not that i'm saying it wasn't a terrorist attack but i do find myself wondering 'how easy would it of been after the initial attack for the president with F16s already cirulating in the air to suddenly think, hey the pentagons empty go blow that up, and send in a f16 with a rocket to doubly confirm the feel of fear?' what do you think?

How easy would that of been? Pretty easy i'd say and it would be textboook neocon behaviour like with the propoganda against the soviet threat when there was none for years and years.

But it probably was a terrorist act even though there is a lot of evidence generally that doesn't add up, i'm just cynical i guess.

52.

At 09:00 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

simuvac wrote:

If there was so much confusion around 9/11, and the FBI and the BBC could not properly identify the hijackers, why did the FBI release a list of 19 names, connected to one of the most infamous crimes in history, within 24 hours of the attacks? Imagine if all crime investigations were conducted this way, with random accusations being made without evidence or indictment, let alone a crime as infamous as this?

The first list of hijackers from the FBI contained 4 names of passengers who were not Arabic, later removed. Is the FBI just the most incompetent organization on earth, with the BBC a willing accomplice? Or, what is more likely, was the FBI demonstrating a familiar pattern of deception: always get your propaganda out there first, before another story becomes the original story against which all others must compare.

The BBC is now complicit with erasing history, because even a trail of mistakes can be meaningful. The mistakes, if they are that, may demonstrate an intent to deceive.

Regardless, the US government has not proved anything about the identities of the hijackers, nor does it matter at this point. 9/11 has been exposed as a lie in myriad ways. The BBC is just another piece of the corporatist propaganda machine, and though I would like to entreat you to do some actual investigative reporting on 9/11, I know how futile such a request would be.

53.

At 09:03 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

willy wrote:

It all simple the us goverment were involved in the attacks.,it was planned and done by the the us goverment.

54.

At 09:06 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Citizen j wrote:

Please add mine to the list of names kept in that big black book of dissidents asking you to actually investigate the 9/11 incidents. I of course don't expect you to, being as you're complicit in the creation of the current atmosphere of willful ignorance. Don't feel bad; you once produced Monty Python. Not every fascist puppet media outlet gets to spawn genius of that caliber. Orwell would be proud.

55.

At 09:08 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Raymond Denson wrote:

Of all the conspiracy theories, the official account of what happened on 9/11 is the most ludicrous.

That four or five Arabs, armed with little more than razor blades, could subdue the passengers and crew, drag the pilot and copilot out of the cockpit, fly and navigate the

Boeing 757 or 767 through the clouds to hit a specific building with pinpoint accuracy, is a ridiculous fantasy, rendered even more absurd by the suggestion that it was directed from a cave in Afghanistan.

Let us all support the 9/11 truth movement.

56.

At 09:19 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Babur wrote:

The 9.11 attacks were well planned and executed by Amercian Government with the help of Isreal so that they can start the crussades on Muslim. So within few seconds Talibans on the other side of the world were blamed. The most strongest(military wise), most wealthy (money) and most advance(technology) country blames the most poorest and most remote country for the attack. Well even the most stupid man cannot blame Afghanistan or any other organization in Afghanistan carrying theese attacks. Well the target of America and Isreal was the Plotical Islam, as Taliban has formed an Islamic Government(according to their faith and blieves) and whole of the West including most of the muslim countries ( as muslim countries are ruled by dictators supported by America and West) want to get rid of the Taliban as they were the greatest danger to the Impearlism. The whole world supported America on its attack on Afghanistan no body dare ask Amercians on what grounds the Afghanistan to be blamed, The Aeroplanes flew from their airports not from afghanistan, they got training from America not Afghanistan and all clues if present were inside America not Afghanistan. I think may be after 20 or 30 years the truth will be revealed and the world may see the the true face of America as no doubts the attacks on WTC were planned and carried out my no body but by Amercian government itself.

57.

At 09:27 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Mistah wrote:

Once again the BBC tries to tarnish its once excellent reputation by happily appeasing the thugs that sought to control it after the Hutton inquiry.

Editing a story once it has been archived smacks of attempting to change history. The Ministry of Truth would have been so proud.

Think about things people, who has really benefited from the 'war' on terror? There are still significant questions that are yet to be answered, yet we are so freely sacrificing our freedoms to those whom ask for them in the wake of such events.

58.

At 10:17 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Brian McHugh wrote:

"We recently asked the FBI for a statement, and this is, as things stand, the closest thing we have to a definitive view: The FBI 'is confident' that it has positively identified the nineteen hijackers responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks."... CONFIDENT?... CONFIDENT? How about 'ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN'?

"Also, the 9/11 investigation was thoroughly reviewed by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States and the House and Senate Joint Inquiry. Neither of these reviews ever raised the issue of doubt about the identity of the nineteen hijackers."... Further to the first statement, this is a joke? So they are not certain, but see no reason to doubt or clarify the assumptions made?

Ps. I would hardly trust the competence of the 9/11 investigation being reviewed by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States and the House and Senate Joint Inquiry, when between the lot of them they still can or will not discuss the extraordinary collapse of WTC building 7.

These things are facts... Something the BBC seem to have become blind to.

59.

At 10:38 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

George wrote:

This should clear up any confusion: <https://www.911proof.com>

60.

At 10:55 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Mark Gobell wrote:

Bravo BBC. I, along with hundreds of thousands of other consumers of your publicly funded propaganda machine gave up believing most of what you pass off as journalism a long long time ago. How is anyone supposed to react when you compound your failing standards of independence and impartiality when you edit past articles ? For who's benefit did you make the edit ? Are you planning to correct the myriad of mistakes and inaccuracies you have printed, published and spoken of over past decades, or is 9/11 deserving of special attention ? Can I have my money back please. All of it. Because like you I have made mistakes paying it to you all of these years and I would like to rectify that mistake now, with your help.

61.

At 11:09 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

teagan wrote:

To say that:

"Neither of these reviews ever raised the issue of doubt about the identity of the nineteen hijackers."

is not to say that there is no issue of doubt. It merely says that the issue was not raised.

I agree whole heartedly with David. Shame is the word. Shame all round.

62.

At 11:26 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Diederiq wrote:

Sadly, the BBC has decided to comprehensively neuter itself after the great Hutton report. It has degenerated from a forthright, almost objective, reliable provider of news into a cowardly mouthpiece for her paymasters. Thoroughly sickening! I'm only sorry the Guardian doesn't have a World Service TV and radio. (I'm not taking bets on this comment being published, either...)

63.

At 11:26 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Indy wrote:

Unless I am mistaken Steve you are one of the first, if not the first BBC reporter, to invite this kind of dialogue in regards to 911 on a BBC platform to date. I find that interesting, and though not a man of faith, I try and be optimistic of people.

I want to ask you a question please that you need only ask yourself. Just answer yourself honestly.

What would happen to you in terms of your career if you started running-or attempted to run- stories relating to alternative 911 theory? Given that you work in media you surely are aware of such theories and as a man of reason must find many such questions worthy of attention, no?

The worry for the BBC should really be this, when it does come out that the official 911 conspiracy theory is wholly deceptive and that the true machinations of that event are far less pleasant than most people would like to know (but should), the BBC, and possibly reporter's such as your good self; will be forever stigmatized by association of the bbc's

media blackout on discussing what actually did happen that day, leading up to that day, and in the aftermath of that day.

I have no malice toward you though, Indeed I am uplifted to a see a BBC reporter actually allowing for this topic to arise, whether publicly presented as indirect or otherwise, I am precognitive enough to know that was not unforeseen on your part. It should still be noted however that the BBC has failed miserably to encourage debate, or report on the stronger alternative 911 theories of that day, thus far since 2001. That is 5 years of denying and actively blacking out news on any other theory other than those which are sanctioned by governments and other influential interests. For this truth I do not raise my glass to you but do raise my eyebrow, You might just possibly of reached a turning point in your career, then again you might not and I might simply be to you another crazy. I hope the former is true Sir, because this global epiphany will occur sooner than most might expect, but I guess it's like George said

'your either with us, or your with the terrorists' ...tough call, Especially when the answer leads to the same place.

It is not to late yet Steve for you and your organization to get on the right page.

Just ask your that question again. The truth about 911 will come out, simple. When it does organizations will fall and whither in exponential succession depending on whether they have assisted, willingly, unwillingly, or simply by irresponsible judgement; in the perpetration of the deception and cover up against the global community. Organizations like the BBC will not be afforded the claim of ignorance, the BBC will incur great damage as the public become angry and distrusting of them. Enough is enough, stop hiding please. HELP US.

64.

At 11:38 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Jason Lisburn wrote:

Changing the original story, do you mean editing the historical record? Isn't that what Winston Smith's job was in 1984?

"The 9/11 attack was driven by Osama Bin Laden" (quoting the 9-11 Commission Report) Not according to the FBI, who still refuses to list bin Laden as wanted in connection with 9-11, because in the words of Rex Tomb, FBI Chief of Investigative Publicity - "the FBI has no hard evidence connected (sic) Bin Laden to 9/11". You don't fine a traffic speeder without hard evidence (speed camera photo). But invading other countries, no that's fine...

You also fail to mention Cheney's comments to the 9-11 commission (PBS Frontline doc 'The Dark Side') that at one point he understood two planes had been shot down, you think he'd know, being that he was in control of the immediate military response (or non-response you could argue). Was Cheney hallucinating, and if so is it wise to have someone so unstable as VP of the USA; running around thinking he's ordered planes shot down?

Much of the evidence points to a covert black op in conjunction with Pakistan's ISI (where Atta's \$100,000 actually came from; a man meeting with top US officials during the week of 9-11.)

The press is supposed to be the forth estate of our democracy. When other 'estates' are contradicting each other the press is duty bound to investigate and clarify. The BBC is supposed to be the bastion of the truth and impartiality yet it has failed to adequately investigate.

That's what the majority of 'conspiracy theorists' want, a fully funded independant investigation; too much to ask in light of nearly 3,000 deaths? Seems so. Shame, really.

65.

At 11:57 PM on 27 Oct 2006,

Nazir Khaki wrote:

I couldn't agree more with many of the posts here - but let us ask each other - how much of what we say or type is actually acknowledged by the media? 5 years, and all that we can come up with is ridiculous theories - while the facts point to something else. So what next? How and what can be done?!

66.

At 12:21 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Michael Valdiny wrote:

I was glad at your attempt to debunk some of the 9/11 myths. Unfortunately, I think you are flogging a dead horse. There are currently 22 million 9/11 conspiracy web sites on the net. There are dozens of Alex Jones and other assorted crack pots on Google videos. As a Psychologist, I am extremely worried about the relentless rise of this nonsense. My own son became involved in this conspiracy mind movement during his studies at university. And although I tried to counter it, all rational argument failed. It was more difficult when he came across Michael Meacher MP, tacitly supporting many of the theories. Perhaps it is time Newsnight did some analysis on the subject.

67.

At 12:33 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Rob wrote:

I won't wax too lyrical about this as it is obviously a case of one more corporation being bought off.

What I will do is recommend, as my 9/11 Truth comrade did earlier:

Webster Tarpley - Synthetic Terrorism

Alex Jones - Terrorstorm (DVD)

Aaron Russo - America: Freedom to Fascism (DVD)

Also visit: [www.infowars.com](http://www.infowars.com)

Learn the truth, wake up and resist.

68.

At 12:45 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Mike wrote:

As I read these comments all I can say is Ditto, Ditto, Ditto, to the 90% who see the FRAUD with the "official story" as any REASONABLE and INTELLIGENT person who has ACTUALLY REVIEWED THE FACTS can see. And watching the news is NOT being well informed on this issue!!

69.

At 01:25 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Jon wrote:

It's all a bit 1984 (Orwell) editing the news from the past...

70.

At 01:45 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Derick FD McLaughlin wrote:

Nil illegitimi carborundum.

71.

At 02:48 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Moriae Encomium wrote:

As seen here, many are stunned by the reluctance of mainstream media to do what's supposed to do, especially when we talk about investigative journalism. The amount of

(pardon me for being a bit upset) crap & fodder which flows around on this subject is unbearable. Commission, NIST, FEMA reports are farce for anyone who was willing to go through them, and especially for those who know background behind that particular play. Same thing goes for someone who tried to peek behind the impenetrable walls of improbable Wikipedia! Popular mechanics!? I won't Galileo Galilei and Sir Isaac Newton beck in the class; let them shine some light on whole dark matter dimming domino effecting freefall crap! It took Bush 411! days to appoint Chairman of that commission, it sure did take you a hell of a lot more time to catch up... I'll tell you one thing which I'm certain of, if this installment of fear and terror upon humanity was deliberate, then all what we can loose if we conduct the proper investigation is fear itself... Every time this story comes up, its being hushed, or redirected in whirlwind of disinformation's. Damage control? Spin practice? This is a full blowback time, and I'd say it's about time... Those pictures of Pentagon lawn are not amusing anymore! Guessing game is not amusing anymore, this was attack on humanity, and every answer we got so far was lie. Like Iraq wasn't enough, like media couldn't prevent that outrageous 911/Saddam link! So much unnecessary death, such shame on us all...

72.

At 03:40 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Moriae Encomium wrote:

That particular terminology? It is neither prudent, nor decent, nor sufficient.., and it definitely isn't logical. Why would anyone tie valid and serious questions with term conspiracy? Fabulous design there, as with terrorism... who's the terrorist? One nation's terrorist is other nation's freedom fighter, isn't it? But apart from all that fear & terror nonsense everyone is used to, why all this reluctance? What is that? Do peopling have to depend on independent Hollywood and/or free artists for guidelines? Take that new Garfield flick.., I was at movie house with toddlers earlier and I have to hear Carlyle one hundred times? Sic. And it is pointed with sings and served so desperately!?? Or that US versions? Such as that everybody loves Raymond humor with that picture of Skreek (Scream) in their bedroom!? Would you folks please come out of that cover and put things in some perspective; you should have done that when Rumsfeld said that freedom is untidy! People who live in reality don't have to watch flicks to learn about Carlyle group! Why don't you look that up a bit, give the people some decent foreknowledge, not that sublime you usually serve... just follow the stench of damn money.., oh I forgot, It will lead you right back home... Pih, V for Vendetta indeed... Tell you what; we, and that is us as a whole in all our diversity, thanks the likes of neo-con GOP (PNAC) and your particular hardliners there are pressing restart to continue for some time now... so from my perspective, it is no wonder that the whole wide world is dialing 911... Well, you certainly wouldn't edit history without a pressure; perhaps you are already free as you will ever be? Good Night & Good Luck...

73.

At 05:24 AM on 28 Oct 2006,

Bernard wrote:

Altering history by Governments seems to be the norm for everything that happens. So, BBC you are doing just what Governments want (or tell) you to do.

It's about time you started to be what you claim to be, and report the news, not half news, altered news, and Government lies.

9/11 was an obvious scam, false flag, whatever. It was an evil way to take away freedom from the American people, and destroy the Constitution.

The London bombings in my opinion were the same. It is about time the BBC earned the money they get from the British public, and investigated this abomination.

Watch this documentary on Google video:

[Ludicrous Diversion](#)

Independant investigative reporters do try to get to the truth of matters, unlike BBC reporters it seems. If you are unsure about what needs exposing about the London bombings, watch the video. In fact everybody should watch it, **it should be shown on the television.**

74.

At **06:51 AM** on 28 Oct 2006,

Phil wrote:

Yes, I always hoped BBC had the journalistic integrity to dig up the truth.

The 9/11 widows who question the official version deserve better...

See their movie '9/11: Press for Truth' to understand why they have not accepted what fewer and fewer people still continue to believe.

It is indeed a '9/11 Truth Movement' and soon you won't be able to ignore it... And let's not forget what Loose Change director Dylan Avery said in the Vanity Fair interview that if enough people realize what really happened on 9/11, we'll have a Second American Revolution...

75.

At **09:34 AM** on 28 Oct 2006,

Josef Merker wrote:

The BBC, most of the media and the public at large seems to be mentally challenged by the following question: Does the fact, that there ARE stupid conspiracy theories, really cancel out those questions that arise from a professional point of view, such as: the collapse of WTC7 (see Danny Jowenko on Youtube); the ability or inability of poorly trained folks to stunt-fly 767s; the possibility of the BIG LIE being applied in contemporary western politics. Think about it before forcing the world into a simplistic matrix that is too small for the complex world we live in. It's pretty obvious that the BBC - just as the stupid conspiracy theories - make the world far simpler than it really is. Pray for the US to get over the existential problems that currently threaten to emerge as the number one enemy of this important republic.

76.

At **09:59 AM** on 28 Oct 2006,

brianvernon wrote:

No doubt the comments section has been closed, due to 5,000,000 comments, but here's another anyway.

Just go and look at the footage of the semi-invisible black blobs hitting the towers. FAKE

Look at the Pentagon tapes. FAKE

Look at the crash site in Pennsylvania.

FAKE.

77.

At **11:02 AM** on 28 Oct 2006,

German Bloke wrote:

Some links for Steve Herrman:

<https://www.medienanalyse-international.de/identitaeten.html>

<https://www.medienanalyse-international.de/abledanger%20und%20doppelatta.html>

78.

At **01:16 PM** on 28 Oct 2006,

Beauchard wrote:

Funny, how you made a change to the original story, yet the FBI refuses to correct this obvious error. How is it that this along with so many other obvious errors go uncorrected, clear contradictions go unquestioned, and troubling quotes and accounts go unnoticed. If anyone there are BBC News, or anyone else for that matter, wants to do some real investigations into any of this, they should start at <https://www.cooperativeresearch.org/>,

and I would recommend the documentary based on this research "Press for Truth" which can be found on google video. 9/11 synthetic terror is good for advancing an alternative theory. However, I would urge you to begin simply by objectively looking through the research and realize that there are plenty questions still surrounding the attacks.

79.

At 02:11 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Jules wrote:

@Lester

Nice parody, the use of all upper case really set your message off!

In seriousness, just because we may not believe the governments are telling the whole truth doesn't mean they masterminded the whole thing, or knew about it. There are plenty of sites out there that debunk the truthers. Start at <https://forums.randi.org/> for some healthy debate.

80.

At 02:28 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Ahmed Abouelhoda wrote:

Have mercy and respect for the almost 3000 dead. The 911 conspiracy theory belongs in the realm of the grassy knoll and tin foil hats.

81.

At 03:18 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Worried honest citizen wrote:

Read the civil and mechanical engineering reports. The official version of how and why those buildings came down is quite simply a physical impossibility. And that's just the tip of the iceberg.

State of denial is right. We're in grave danger here. Working class American republican voters don't want details. In fact they DESPISE detail and nuance. They mock it as a weakness. Top earning American republican voters know very well what's going on and effectively allow themselves to be bribed into acquiescence by tax breaks... we're talking SIGNIFICANT money here. The GOP has the people with the brawn and the wealth all sewn up. That's power.

The neocons stated that they needed a new Pearl Harbor event to advance their agenda, and so they went and manufactured one. Read the manifesto of the New Citizen Project/Project for the New American Century. Check out the names of their members. Check out how many of them are in government positions.

There is an incredible amount of blatant evidence available. It's getting to the point now where the government barely even has to hide its tracks. Anyone challenging the official versions of anything is labelled a traitor, unpatriotic and unamerican. People are being brainwashed to the point where they are choosing to ignore, deny and forget facts. It's an incredible feat of manipulation.

Ordinary permanent residents of foreign origin (anyone!) can be picked off the streets and "disappeared" legally here now thanks to a recent tweak to the law. The government doesn't even have to tell them why they've been kidnapped, or charge them (EVER), or EVER inform their families where they are. That's a fact.

Why doesn't the BBC conduct a FULL investigation into what's going on in America, including 9/11? The world desperately needs honest, stoneturning, tireless, relentless, fearless journalism... before it's too late, and America slips into facism. We're certainly not going to get it on this side of the Atlantic. This isn't your usual social democrat vs. conservative wrangle. There's some serious mindbending going on here.

82.

At 03:51 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Guðjón wrote:

It's getting a bit late for a ridiculous spin like that. It is obvious most people are on to the bush administration at this point and further attempts by the mainstream media to silence them will not be successful. Those who have seen the distortions and lies they have told in the past will know that the media is complicit in the attacks by mindlessly repeating unsubstantiated claims made by the US government and FBI. We know who to trust and it is certainly not "BBC trust"

The BBC has made great documentaries that some would call "conspiracies" The Revolution will not be televised, Fallujah the hidden massacre, Century of the Self and Power of nightmares. But their regular news reporting is most of the time highly sophisticated propaganda.

The BBC was not the only source to talk about the "surviving hijackers". The Guardian and the Telegraph also had them for an interview.

Also I find it blatantly misleading to act as if there is some confusion about the names when the original piece clearly states that they could confirm they were the supposed hijackers, they'd been in the same flight schools but had their passports stolen etc.

One day you will all choke on your lies.

83.

At 05:20 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

bob wrote:

The BBC actually legitimizes/covers-up corruption, wars, murder and lies. We pay through the nose for the BBC to divert attention from issues of upmost importance to us and to a lesser extent the rest of the world.

I hope that the BBC keeps churning out more substandard drivel and hopefully people will stop paying their extortionate license fees. Has anyone seen torchwood? Absolutely pathetic.

Airing "the road to 9/11" which was made by religious zealots for the republicans really was a new low, even by current American editorial standards.

How low can the BBC go? Well it depends on how much of our hard earned cash is on the table.

PS please stop justifying Israeli war crimes.

84.

At 05:27 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Rob wrote:

The way the BBC have capitulated to the NWO is truly frightening. The BBC have always stood for truly great reporting. That is now a thing of the past.

Ben recommended Webster Tarpley's book, and it is excellent, but let me recommend a couple of DVDs also.

Alex Jones' Terrorstorm and Aaron Russo's America: Freedom to Fascism.

Both are brave, truthful and fascinating. Please, don't let the criminals win.

85.

At 06:54 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Paul C. wrote:

When Davin Coburn of Popular Mechanics (publishers of the book "Debunking 9/11 Myths") was asked about the BBC report during a Phoenix, Arizona talk show interview, Coburn labelled the BBC account false, and pointed to the fact that DNA had established

that all the hijackers died on board the planes.

When pressed as to where the original DNA came from that was matched against the alledged hijacker's remains, Coburn became flustered, evasive and sought to change the topic. The interview was concluded shortly thereafter.

86.

At 08:29 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

david b wrote:

The BBC lost all respect from me after the 911 debacle. So much has been missed from their supposed journalism. They simply regurgitate the spin and propaganda put to them by governments and politicians.

Shameful. . .

87.

At 08:35 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

M. Fernandez wrote:

It's far too late to sanitize your archives. Anti-American garbage spouted by the BBC and its deliberate selection of questionable 'experts' is a significant cause of the conspiracy nutters (fully represented here). The rest of us have just learned to live with them. [A tolerance not reciprocated, so the BBC should be wary of what its spawned].

88.

At 11:51 PM on 28 Oct 2006,

Joseph wrote:

Recent polls clearly show that the government's own unproven conspiracy theory is losing ground and more and more people are waking up to their pattern of lies and are asking questions. Indeed, I asked myself just what is conspiratorial about demanding a thorough impartial examination of that horrendous event on 9/11 an event that has been used to justify illegal invasions and have destroyed two countries and killed tens of thousands of people?

89.

At 12:05 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

lester wrote:

IT IS INTERESTING TO SEE HOW PEOPLE ARE BRAINWASHED INTO BELIEVING OTHER THEORIES AS PREVIOUSLY STATED BUT THE REAL CONSPIRACY GOES ON. THE QUESTION I WOULD ASK ABOUT 9/11 IS WHAT IS THE TOTAL COST IN LIVES FOR THAT DAY AND AS THE BUILDING WAS SUPPOSED TO BE ALLWEATHER PROOF WHY HAS NOONE SUED THE BUILDERS,WHO INCIDENTALLY FILED FOR CHAPTER 11.THAT CANNOT STOP THEIR INSURERS LIABILITY BUT PROTECTS THE OWNERS.ALSO WHILE ON THIS SUBJECT WHO ARE THE REBUILDING CONTRACTORS.THE STATE CAN CONDONE LOSS OF LIFE IF IT IS FOR THE "GREATER GOOD" BUT WHOS VERSION ARE WE TO LIVE UNDER. I KNOW OF A MEETING ONE MONTH BEFORE 9/11 WHERE A GROUP OF PEOPLE WERE TOLD OF BIN LADENS INVOLVEMENT IN THE CHANGE OF THE WORLD ORDER. YHE REASON HE HAS NOT BEEN ARRESTED IS THAT HE IS PROTECTED.INCIDENTALLY GEORGE BUSH SENIOR SAID ON 9/11/90 THAT HE AND HIS GROUP NOW HAD THE FRAMEWORK FOR A NEW WORLD ORDER.ANYONE SEEN THAT?IN HEBREW NUMEROLOGY 9 IS THE NUMBER OF YESOD "THE FOUNDATION" AND 11 IS THE NUMBER OF MARTYRDOM AND CREATING A NEW FAITH" BUT THIS CONSPIRACY IS NOT JEWISH LED BUT THOSE WHO WOULD SEEK THEIR PRIZE.

90.

At 12:05 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

Winston Smith wrote:

I'm really suprised that these comments aren't edited or removed.

91.

At 02:10 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

Alexander Alt wrote:

So, if any of those pointed out as hijackers from 9/11 are "still alive," why have they not come forward to say "Hey! We didn't do this! We are alive!"

In the Arab world, there are lots of people with a similar name. In Latin America, being a Juan Gonzalez or a Pablo Rodriguez is no big deal. So if men with these names were hijackers, for the BBC or anyone else to find someone with a similar or even exactly same name is nothing.

Show me where one of those named as a 9/11 hijackers has done an interview since September 11, 2001, claiming to have been a hijacker but also being alive.

You won't find one because one hasn't happened. Only nutters think it has, which shows the level of their intelligence.

92.

At 03:57 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

Sir Truth wrote:

The video "Loose Change" demonstrates that 9/11 was certainly an inside job! Watch it free on Google video & many other sites!

93.

At 04:08 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

Tim wrote:

Buildings do not collapse symmetrically at near free fall speed if there are any vertical supports in the floors below the damage zone. The resistance provided by the lower floors slows the collapse.

<https://janedoe0911.tripod.com/BilliardBalls.html>

That is the explanation by Dr. Judy Wood as to why the government's version just isn't possible.

So the collapse didn't slow so there was to quote the NIST "little resistance provided by the lower floors". There's the understatement of all time!

So how do you remove all the vertical supports in a building simultaneously?

94.

At 10:07 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

mark fisher wrote:

"In the intervening years we have also reported in detail on the investigation into the attacks, the 9/11 commission and its report."

You are having a laugh, YES you may have reported on the official investigation but how accurate was it? what happened to investigative journalism ? the BBC seems to be running scared since Dr kelly .Why are you not asking questions ????? I did not give the 911 conspiracy thing much thought till I saw a video on google videos, 911 mysteries(high quality).check out the 911 archives on prisonplanet.com then come back and tell us there isn't something worth investigating here.

Not all the people voicing doubts about the official theory are crackpots & loons. There are now some eminent professionals asking the type of questions that our "independent" journalists should be asking.

‘Truth fears nothing but concealment’ (Proverb)

95.

At 10:51 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

jer wrote:

Another example of changing the facts to fit the story.

Stay the course.

96.

At 11:48 AM on 29 Oct 2006,

Steve wrote:

Any research into the events surrounding 9/11 using public records freely available to all show that the official version of events contain major lies from the USA government.

The attacks on the USA on 9/11 is the biggest event of recent times, yet no major media has reported it fairly, including the BBC.

I pay a licence fee to the BBC partly for unbiased news, yet on the issue of 9/11 there is virtual censorship. I am more than concerned that the leading news outlet of the world, once trusted worldwide, has fallen prey to politics.

To accept FBI statements on the hijackers that show no proof of their involvement apart from their 'word' on the matter is close to being complicit in their cover-up.

Wake up BBC! You work for the people who pay your wages, and that means the general public, NOT government agencies desperately trying to keep the lid on the biggest story you will ever cover.

97.

At 12:45 PM on 29 Oct 2006,

Andrew Lowe Watson wrote:

To date the BBC has not shown on its news programmes any of the footage of the destruction of WTC7, nor has it reported the numerous testimony of experts such as leading Swiss professors of Building Construction Hugo Bachmann, Jörg Schneider or Daniele Gänser, or that of top Dutch demolition chief Danny Jowenko, all of whom have publicly and unambiguously stated their conviction that the 47- storey skyscraper was demolished with explosives by a professional demolition team.

To make matters worse, the archive site that covers the fall of the Twin Towers does not even mention WTC7. When I complained about the inaccuracy of the previous archive site's description of its demise

(first version: "WTC7 burned to the ground" was changed to "WTC7 collapsed in flames", neither of which was true even by the standards of the official NIST report) the site was changed. Now it has gone.

The BBC is meant to be a trusted source of information. Yet it ignores an event such as this, only the third steel-framed building in history to collapse as a result of fire, the other two being the Twin Towers.

Legitimate questions have been asked over the lack of coverage of this event. By not reflecting the public's interest in WTC7, the BBC have compromised their reputation for impartiality.

98.

At 02:17 PM on 29 Oct 2006,

Alex wrote:

It makes me laugh when people say 9/11 wasn't a conspiracy, 'cos I'm fairly sure those 19 hijackers did some kind of planning together.

99.

At 03:30 PM on 29 Oct 2006,

envis wrote:

Personally I think the BBC story isn't even that important in proving that some of the

hijackers are still alive. The Guardian [Reported](#) that Mohammed Atta, the 'lead hijacker' is still alive according to his father Mohammed el-Amir Atta. World Net Daily also [Reported](#) on the confusion, as did [CNN](#) who interviewed Ziad Jarrah's family. The Telegraph has also revealed how the men's [identities were stolen](#). There's also the small problem of there being [no Arab names](#) on the autopsy list for flight 77.

But don't worry about that, it seems the BBC has finally put all the 'conspiracy theories' to rest now. I wonder what the BBC's definition of a conspiracy theory is? Anything that doesn't fall in line with the official story by the looks of it.

How about refuting Omissions and Distortions by David Ray Griffin, and 9/11 Synthetic Terror by Webster Tarpley. Perhaps then the British Public might start believing what the BBC has to say again, I doubt it though.

100.

At [06:44 PM](#) on 29 Oct 2006,

Darren wrote:

It's not the BBC's job to investigate conspiracies, but this would make one hell of a Panorama show.

101.

At [08:48 AM](#) on 30 Oct 2006,

Mat wrote:

I would like to thank those of you from the bbc who were recently involved in the 'Editorial Discussions" for finally providing to not only myself but to countless millions across the globe the one vital piece of information that will be recognised from this day onwards as a turning point in regards to our long held & seemingly erroneous perceptions of the events that took place on 911 & to that also of our limited understanding in regards to that of the laws of physics (as it would seem). Just for the record would you be able to further enlighten me as to whether or not the passport found in the rubble that narrowly avoided being vapourised along with everything else belonged to the above mentioned individual?

Regards Mat.

102.

At [01:11 PM](#) on 30 Oct 2006,

gregor Aitken wrote:

I believe George W bush

911 happened lets get on with things

103.

At [01:33 PM](#) on 30 Oct 2006,

John wrote:

This thread is pure genius. Whoever is moderating this clearly has a sense of humour as they've given every weirdo a soap box to air their opinions. Do they have any idea how insane they all sound?

I must admit I enjoy reading conspiracy theories purely to laugh at the total insanity displayed. I'm surprised that none of the idiots gathered here today have noticed that the hole left in the side of the second tower looked exactly like the profile of a UFO. Maybe they were trying to send ET back home from Roswell but he was too busy taking pictures and flew into the tower?

104.

At [03:18 PM](#) on 30 Oct 2006,

Sheldon wrote:

You're all a bunch of crackpots.

105.

At 05:01 PM on 30 Oct 2006,

David wrote:

Thank you for taking the trouble to mention the change and the fact that it caused discussion within the BBC. (It might have saved some of all the Orwell references if you'd mentioned that you recorded the fact of the change on the page itself.)

There is a wider issue here that has been alluded to in some of the comments - that pages with news are edited (occasionally without changing the timestamp), or they are replaced in a way that leaves it hard to find the original (in my experience the search function is not very reliable for this).

One solution would be to adopt a Wikipedia-style History page that would allow people who use the site as an archive to see just how the news broke and when. Not to mention critics who believe that the BBC is continually adjusting the news in pursuit of some vast and complex conspiracy.

106.

At 10:40 AM on 31 Oct 2006,

Daniel J. wrote:

This 9/11 issue will not go away. More people are coming to the conclusion that the official story is bullshit every day. 9/11 skeptics will not be silenced by ridicule and namecalling. There will be a full investigation!

107.

At 05:26 PM on 31 Oct 2006,

Richard Boyle wrote:

"The size of the lie is a definite factor in causing it to be believed, because the vast masses of a nation are, in the depths of their hearts, more easily deceived than they are consciously and intentionally bad."

Adolph Hitler

The idea that 9/11 was a conspiracy is, in terms of its political implications, ridiculous and unthinkable. The ideas that the WTC towers were brought down by burning jet fuel (or that a 40 metre wingspan, 100 tonne plane crashed into the pentagon, leaving only a 9 metre hole and no wreckage at the impact point or burn marks on the lawn, or that flight 93 did the same) are, in physical terms, comical. And I doubt any fair minded person would prioritise politics over physics.

I am paranoid? I am wrong? I am a nutter? Then why does the bbc not produce programmes containing detailed, impartial scientific analyses to explain to me why this is the case, to "educate and inform" me. Because I am not alone.

The fact that the bbc so clearly refuses to engage with what is a provable, defencible physical case makes it very difficult not to become paranoid.

108.

At 07:25 PM on 31 Oct 2006,

jani\_nwfp wrote:

The attack on twin towers was so perfectly planned, that it seems impossible that some individuals has made it. The involement of some org; even of Amercians departments cannot be ruled out.

Poltics has so maney ugly faces, to counter his enemies the Bush adminstration has used the 9/11 mishap in his fevour.

Bush has made this world more un-safe by his actions in the name of anti-terroists activities.

I think that all the confelecting parties should have dilouge under the umberla of U.N.Jani

109.

At 05:30 AM on 01 Nov 2006,

GUY FOX wrote:

Steve:

I'm a political analyst for "the boys in the basement" (a.k.a: "the Horse's Mouth"). I get paid to do (and sometimes "doodoo") various "odd jobs," one of them is to serve as a conduit for planting information on the internet. The BBC is one of the "recipients" of information and opinions from "the horse's mouth." I am the vehicle... the conduit.

We've observed that 90% of the comments that I'm paid to post on "Have Your Say" are censored by the editors up there. Somebody at the BBC is doing a disservice to your organization and to your readers.

And now to the subject at hand for this e-mail. Since 2004 I've been assigned to do some investigative work by "the boys in the basement" on the possibility of a coverup by U.\$ Federal authorities in regard to 9/11. My very specific assignmnt has been to compare official crash site photos of Flight 93, the plane that alleged-lie and convenient-lie crashed at a remote area (a reclaimed strip mine) in Shanksville, PA., with photos of other crash sites around the world.

We are now 98% sure that a plane did NOT crash at the Shanksville site. A good case in point is the very recent crash of a plane in Nigeria. Photos of that crash show a tail and various wing parts... and also a landing gear and the remains of an engine.

The crash site for Flight 93... shows nothing, absolutely nothing but an odd hole in the ground that is too small for such a large plane. There are vitually no recognizable parts of a plane at Shanksville. No seats... no titanium landing gears... no tails or wing parts... no engines, etc. Officially-dumb says that the plane evaporated upon impact. Little or nothing could be retrieved.

The Amerikans are covering something up on this very specific issue (Flight 93). At the very least... there is a conspiracy to withhold information and facts. Perhaps more than that than. 9/11 is beginning to smell like Lee Harvey Oswald getting shot and killed in 1963 as he was being transferred from one jail to another by 500 cops. This saved the day. After Oswald was murdered... the Amerikans had no need for a trial, a trial that might bring inconvenient truths to light. It is the same with 9/11. The certainty of a coverup on the Flight 93 crash site suggests coverups elsewhere. Indeed! When there's one rotten apple in the barrel, you can expect to find more!

It would be rather sagacious for Ten Downing Street and Parliment to be wary of the Amerikans. After the debacle in Iraq-nam, and giving only lip service for stopping global warming, you might want to reassess your traditional relationship with Amerika. There is a fascist dragon growing over here... and this growing beast has little or no compunction to devour ewe folks across the pond.

This assessment comes from "the Horse's Mouth." I am...

"Guy Fox"

110.

At 02:32 PM on 01 Nov 2006,

Steve wrote:

Listen. I'm as sceptical as they come.

I reject the lazy thinking that gives ground to everything from organised religion to various conspiracy theories. There's no shortage of lazy thinking and lunacy on the internet, not least concerning this topic.

And yet...

Even I can accept there are just far too many holes in the official version of events (the

9/11 Commission Report) for it to go unchallenged.

One expects coincidence and incompetence to come into play when accounting for a lot of the so-called anomalies of that day. Of course it would. The attempted cover up of human error is bound to play some part. But the fact remains, there are simply "too many" lingering questions that have been sidestepped, and frankly, just too many coincidences.

I completely understand why you aren't touching this area. You would obviously open yourselves up to a barrage of hostility. You'd be accused of all sorts from all quarters, from treachery to lunacy, from anti-Americanism to terrorist-sympathising. Of course you're going to be reluctant, to say the least!

Even if an investigation isn't commissioned from on high, it would be great if a bunch of like-minded BBC journalists reading this organised themselves into a group dedicated to looking into some of these areas.

If some of these anomalies turn out to have perfectly valid explanations, then fine. In fact, great. Those elements of the conspiracy theory can be put to sleep, whether it's the 'put options' or pancake theory or whatever. It will all help add clarity.

Personally I'm undecided on the idea of 9/11 having been an inside job. I'm not yet willing to sign up to the notion that it was, but equally unconvinced by the official notion that it wasn't. If my hand was absolutely forced on the matter, I'd have to say 9/11 probably was, to some degree, an inside job, orchestrated by far fewer people than we might imagine, for reasons utterly compelling to those involved, however monstrous they seem to us.

But that's just my gut feeling. I would far rather be reassured to the contrary that there was no insider involvement.

111.

At 02:36 PM on 01 Nov 2006,

gregor Aitken wrote:

There is a time when silence becomes betrayal.

112.

At 04:46 PM on 01 Nov 2006,

Brian J Dickenson wrote:

"The CIA owns everyone of any significance in the major media."

--former CIA Director William Colby

The above is a quote freely accessed.

We obtain our information from the media. Or is this yet another conspiracy theory.

Will you actually print this?

I await with interest.

113.

At 08:31 PM on 01 Nov 2006,

andy wrote:

The funder of lead hijacker Mohammed Atta was head of Pakistan's ISI, Mahmoud Ahmed, Ahmed was in the Whitehouse on 9/11 meeting top officials, US authorities have confirmed Ahmed wired 100k to Atta prior to 9/11. Mahmoud Ahmed has never been questioned by the FBI, why not? Considering thousands of innocent people have died as a consequence of 9/11, why is this funder of this mass murder given a pass?

Why was there a monumental failure of air defence on this particular day? Is it just a coincidence there were drills happening the same day simulating the attacks which actually happened, who was in charge of these drills? In his testimony, Ralph Eberhart of NORAD wouldn't comment when asked who was running these drills.

How can Mohammed Atta be a fundamentalist muslim prepared to kill himself for the cause on one hand and be a raging coke addict who drank like a fish and loved going to strip bars ? i mean by all mean he could have been blending in, but don't you think he over did it a bit ? cocaine addict, drinking most night going to strip bars ? hardly a devout muslim .

Is it physically possible to train in cessnas and then pull off top gun pilot like manovres in giant boeings? particularly in the case of Hani Hanjour who was described as a horrible pilot by his instructor, layman think it would be an easy feat to hit a building, but to come in on a curve and hit it dead on is VRY DIFFICULT MANOVRE, even more so if you've never flown a big boeing before, the pentagon plane showed particularly advanced skills to hit with such precision.

all in all were these clown hijackers actually capable of pulling off such a spectacular feat ?

why are the mainstream media ignoring ALL the pertinent questions it's so frustrating. :(

114.

At [12:43 AM](#) on 02 Nov 2006,

lester wrote:

The real conspiracy is the attempt to cover up that which is obvious to the voyeur. that is the one watching and all truths are rewritten by the victor."When you take away the right to protest then you create terrorists"JFK. This conspiracy is to divert peoples attention from the real issue, that which is concealed.The fact that highest government positions are at stake here means the conspiracy is all the greater. We the cannonfodder are expected to believe these transparently false lies while other atrocities are carried out.Whether in GODS or HUMANITIES NAME." THOU SHALT NOT KILL" should be the overriding principle here but the lack of political will must surely show and be obvious to those "voyeurs" that all is veiled in allegory just like the secret societies of our world and the death of the few out weighs the needs of the many.Their overriding principle is a subdued, docile world totally subservient to the will of those who would murder to solidify their aims and objectives.While you are all afraid of their power, they are killing innocents because of their power struggle which as a 7 hundred year history. not 1776.Who are the real terrorists. A few people with agricultural explosives or those empowering vast armies with the promise of glory or wages. sounds like mercenaries to me.

115.

At [07:48 AM](#) on 02 Nov 2006,

Joe wrote:

I suggest that all those who doubt that this was an evil and wicked act carried out by terrible people should be made to publically apologise to the victims families.

I cannot understand the BBC, it pretends to be un-biased but it only takes a left-wing view on every topic, no doubt you (BBC)will be blaming the British security forces for the underground bombings next.

I say to all you who believe such rot to grow up.

116.

At [08:32 AM](#) on 02 Nov 2006,

Mat wrote:

Gee wizz John, Thanks for the heads up about the UFO I m glad you agree with me that the original story was if nothing else questionable. I feel it my obligation though to correct a couple of errors I picked up on in your post. I suspect you never took the time to actually watch the documentary made on E.T, my point being (1) He was picked up years ago & I know for a fact that his craft made it home without an incident.(2)Anybody can see the hole left in the Trade Tower was made from a craft that originated from Cirius B, which as we all know are totally unsuitable to E.T's race due to the lack of neck support features generally found associated with all craft sold on his home world.(3)The little guy found at Roswell actually died Didnt you read the autopsy report issued by the American Govt, Nor was his name E.T unlike on our world they all receive individual names, this is

done to avoid any possibility of mistaken ID in the event of a vaporization incident. I would like to take this opportunity to also share with you my latest findings, I now understand why the crash site of 93 had no visible debris usually associated with a typical aircraft crash, after taking a second look I will confirm that It was also a UFO crash site & moments before impact it looks again like the emergency vapourise button was used.

117.

At **10:05 AM** on 02 Nov 2006,

Annoyed with the BBC not posting my comments wrote:

Why does the BBC refuse to publish any comments which disagree with it's left wing viewpoint?, I repeat what I have been trying to say. I personally find it disgusting that people accuse the American Government of blowing up it's own citizens, I think each one of you who keeps refuting the evidence and it is available should be made to apologise to the families of the innocents killed by these terrorists, what will it take a nuclear strike on your own country before you start growing up and stop listening to the propaganda spouted by terrorist mouthpieces like the BBC?.

118.

At **12:42 PM** on 02 Nov 2006,

Steve wrote:

-----  
"I suggest that all those who doubt that this was an evil and wicked act carried out by terrible people should be made to publically apologise to the victims families." (Joe)  
-----

You're making a dreadfully lazy assumption here Joe that is quite simply wrong.

Nobody here is doubting that the deaths of nearly 3000 people was an evil and wicked act. To suggest that they are is to hold a woeful misunderstanding of this whole area of discussion.

As for apologising to the victims' families... how about the growing number of these same families who are now similarly questioning the official version of events and demanding answers to the very same things?

Are you suggesting that these same families doubt the evil and wickedness of that day?

119.

At **01:22 PM** on 02 Nov 2006,

Amused wrote:

Nice to see that Lester eventually worked out how to turn off CAPSLOCK.

120.

At **03:17 PM** on 02 Nov 2006,

Joe wrote:

Dear Steve,

I am entitled to my opinion you to yours, however, you presume to state that I am making assumptions, well I would say that you are also making assumptions.

I have made my point clear in my comment, and I find it morally bankrupt of you to try and turn my words on me just because I do not support your world-view.

In future I will check with you before posting any comments in case they do not agree with your skewed perspective on the world...see I also can be unreasonable and make lazy assumptions...easy is it not?.

121.

At **07:35 PM** on 02 Nov 2006,

Steve wrote:

Joe, allow me to hopefully nail this one on the head...

By singling out "all those who doubt that this was an evil and wicked act", you are by implication assuming there are at least sufficient people who hold such doubt as to warrant your bringing it into the discussion in the first place.

If not, and if you agree that even those who doubt the official version of 9/11 (whether in this thread or more generally) still at least share the view that 9/11 was a wicked act carried out by terrible people, then with respect it was surely a fairly redundant point to raise in the first place, and the only purpose it will have served (intentionally or otherwise) is to have implied a connection between questioning the official version of events and failing to share the same sense of horror and outrage.

I called you on that, not because "you don't support my worldview", but because I felt it was misleading and shouldn't go unchallenged.

To suggest that by flagging you up on this, I'm being presumptuous myself (and yet to offer no further clarification of the matter yourself) smells suspiciously of intellectual cowardice I'm afraid.

Of course we're all entitled to our own views, and you're free to believe and say what you want. But the point of a discussion is to have the freedom to challenge those views if and when they appear flawed or misleading - which is all I did.

122.

At 07:55 PM on 02 Nov 2006,

andy wrote:

I DEMAND the BBC do some proper investigative work into the unanswered questions, instead of parrotting the the lies and obvious and disgusting cover up of this mass murder.

Why don't the BBC investigate WHO was it who was in charge of the war games/drills that were happening that day, when head of NORAD Ralph Eberhart was questioned about who was in charge of these drills he replied "no Comment" why could he not reveal who was in command that day ? whos he covering for?.

If the BBC did it's job it would have also uncovered all the contradictions/omissions/distortions of the official account.

why arnt you asking the hardcore 9/11 questions ?.,

123.

At 08:55 PM on 02 Nov 2006,

lester wrote:

Its not a question of caps lock or fun.sometimes the etiquette of language and typing just plain gets in the way.sorry if I offended anyone dont sue me please. Incidentally anyone want to join the next exodus before the fossil fuels run out? otherwise its a long walk to find heaven on earth?

124.

At 12:24 PM on 03 Nov 2006,

John wrote:

Bush said he would smoke Bin Laden out. As he casts around desperately for a credible exit route, it seems like it's the other way around!

125.

At 07:20 PM on 03 Nov 2006,

William R. Fleishman wrote:

Although I highly doubt it, there could be a possibility that the 9/11 attacks were planned by the U.S.

The reader must think about this. The U.S. might have been looking for an excuse to go after Bin Laden and Saddam. Why not stage a terrorist attack? It would give us a good excuse to go after them. This is just my personal opinion, but I think we invaded Iraq because of oil. We wanted the oil and Hussein and bin laden were in the way. I have no

problem with it.

If this is interesting to you then you should read Red Storm Rising.

126.

At 08:00 PM on 03 Nov 2006,

John Doe II wrote:

It is team that the BBC starts some real investigation into 9/11.

It's amazing that a real journalist can be satisfied by stating that "The FBI is confident that it has positively identified the nineteen hijackers responsible for the 9/11 terrorist attacks."

instead of asking how they identified them?

Why they were quite sure that there were cases of stolen identities etc?

What changed their minds etc?

Here are some real questions about the identities of the alleged hijackers:

[https://www.team8plus.org/e107\\_plugins/forum/forum\\_viewtopic.php?3815](https://www.team8plus.org/e107_plugins/forum/forum_viewtopic.php?3815)

And here are very detailed timelines on the 19 alleged hijackers. In many cases there is strong evidence of doubles being at work:

[https://www.team8plus.org/e107\\_plugins/forum/forum\\_viewforum.php?23](https://www.team8plus.org/e107_plugins/forum/forum_viewforum.php?23)

The most definite one is Atta on September 7, 2001:

[https://www.team8plus.org/e107\\_plugins/forum/forum\\_viewtopic.php?3637](https://www.team8plus.org/e107_plugins/forum/forum_viewtopic.php?3637)

Wouldn't that be a starting point for a real journalism? Raising questions based on the facts and not parroting what the FBI says it believes?

127.

At 05:49 PM on 05 Nov 2006,

lester wrote:

Now that Saddam has been sentenced to death ,the world is a more dangerous place.John Reid is already preaching more security. The only security these people need is to be kept from the populace and this is the same as the last words on the teletext report which said that Saddam prefered not to mix but to listen to his secret police reports.Tony Blair and George Bush also listened to their secret police, that is why there was a war.This is the third wave, the first was NATO,the second the world bank and now the world police with the power to disappear people off the streets of their home country anywhere in the world.Incidentally this is not down to everyday secret societies, this is down to one group. In relation to the deaths of 911 how many more died the same way, including "friendly fire".

128.

At 06:26 AM on 06 Nov 2006,

johnwisconsin wrote:

I do not think the offical story is true in any way but I would not be so quick to blame Bush.There is more involved in this story and it goes back to Oklahoma City and a war that is being waged that people do not know of.

129.

At 02:55 PM on 06 Nov 2006,

Moriae Encomium wrote:

Is that all there is, is that all there is

If that's all there is my friends, then let's keep dancing...

So Steve, is this it? Is that all there is? I've read posts like these everywhere, I've seen this discussion on every continent and in every country. And I'm sooo tired of it... Is BBC associated as associated press? Are you as factual as superficial as good old AMANpour is? Reuters? See no evil hear no evil? How long will it take for you to address these ever

burning 911 questions? A month, a year, an eternity? Can't you see how easily this "Fear & Terror Order" can land in freefall, should one cite old Ben Franklin now? Should one talk about military industrial complex, should one post a link to that testimony of that evil succubus called Rice? Norman Mineta? Richard Clark? You folks got all the tools and information's you need, what is lacking then? Freedom?

130.

At 05:11 AM on 07 Nov 2006,

L.Yantsos wrote:

Mr. Herrmann is so slothful that not only will he not follow up on the story about the living "WTC Arab terrorits" (all reporters today seem to be suffering from the same malady - an appalling lack of curiosity), but he will not even stretch himself to read his prior report. This story does not make the prior report clearer. It simply shows that he was lying back then or is lying now.

L.

131.

At 06:06 PM on 07 Nov 2006,

cairo wrote:

As far as proof that things dont add up in the offical story, I'm sure plenty of you have already read and and spread it. The question remains though why this is not approved as a valid discussion in the land where it occured. In the US, as many know, any kind of talk like this is frowned upon and looks disrespectful. Is it really ill talk or is there a more sinister media control in play? Many of us have read George Orwell as kids or young teens. Why is it ridiculous to imagine there are conspiracies? To those that defend the cronies who kill people and make war for covert reasons, I know you have a personal stake. Whether it be you have family in the land taken from Arabs, or have a complex that can't let you handle being wrong, or are just plain racist, the tide will come in...eventually. You may determine how long to stave it off...but rest assured, it will come in regardless.

132.

At 11:17 PM on 10 Nov 2006,

Susan Kipping wrote:

Why weren't the events on September 11, 2001 investigated? Were they not worthy of questions?

133.

At 10:58 PM on 11 Nov 2006,

Rob France wrote:

The aftermath to 9/11 and 7/7 is the biggest news story never covered.

Instead of investigative journalism, BBC news is prostituting itself with providing the public with commerical updates (such as the release of 'Play Station 3' and 'Kylie's new fragrance' and 'comeback tour').

BBC: Where were you when we needed you most?

134.

At 04:57 PM on 12 Nov 2006,

james Canning wrote:

Only the media have the ability to bring attention to the inconsistancies that appear in the 9/11 attacks. Why was there no branding on the second plane? The Pentagon footage does NOT show a plane crashing into it etc! Why is this not addressed? Will we have to rely on news agencies such a al-jazira, which will only be discredited? BBC, BskyB, and the like please do something!

135.

At 10:17 PM on 13 Nov 2006,

anders wrote:

The American corporate owned media have been complicit with the cover up of 9/11 myth, i expected better from the BBC i guess i was wrong, they got caught up in the whole propaganda aswell, compeltly ignoring glaring errors in the official theory.

I'm sick of it, the Bush regime have done nothing but lie through there teeth since it stole the 2000 elections, why do people suddenly believe Bush is a siant when it comes to 9/11 ? is it completly inconceivable that the lies extend to 9/11 ? not in my opinion.

136.

At 08:07 PM on 22 Nov 2006,

Halim Rahmat wrote:

The truth is prevailing. It presents evidence that the World Trade Towers were not struck by commercial airlines but by military tankers flown by remote control – and the Pentagon was not struck by a Boeing 757 but by a smaller aircraft perhaps a military drone. Along with Al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein were trained by the US government for the promise of wars to the US weapon producers! And Hamid Karzai the Afghanistan President is a former consultant for the huge US oil group Unocal belong to a US warlord who has a direct interest in the trans-Afghanistan pipeline!

I challenge BBC to investigate, not to be spoon-fed, and re-instate its integrity.

137.

At 06:08 PM on 23 Nov 2006,

malcks wrote:

Well BBC,when will you pick up this story and ask some questions? 5years later ask some questions i dare you!!!

138.

At 11:30 AM on 28 Nov 2006,

Naeem wrote:

I would like the international court or human rights commision to take action on that. Now atleast we know each and everything about the incident, still nothing comes from the international agencies, which is rediculous. Using the synthetic terror plot America has not even killed thousands of muslims in Afghanistan and Iraq but also destroyed these countries. who is going to ask america (Bush), whatever he is doing is wrong.

139.

At 02:49 AM on 03 Dec 2006,

Richard Hollingbury wrote:

Exactly WHAT has been clarified here? That conspiracy theories concerning 9.11 are all wrong or that a detail has been clarified!

It's quite true that 9.11 has attracted its fair share of wild theories disbursed by even wilder minds but pushing these aside there is a hard core of scientific and well-researched data that proves beyond doubt that, as an example, the three towers that collapsed were not only intended to collapse in advance but were packed with the appropriate explosives to allow them to fall upon themselves as efficiently as possible. Did George Bush plan it? Who knows, but for sure quite a lot of people in a position of power certainly DID know and plan what can only, therefore, be called murder of their own people to justify the so called War on Terror which is murdering thousands more.

140.

At 10:31 PM on 04 Dec 2006,

anders wrote:

I'll put the question about Bush being the "orchestrator" to bed now, NO he wasn't this was concocted in the bowels of the CIA, a black op, Bush probably knew something was going to happen, but there's no way he'd be in the loop of the organizing of such an operation, this man can't even ride a bike properly.

The man your looking for is Dick Cheney, he was running a sperete control and command center on 9/11 over seeing "drills" which erily simulated the one that actually happened.

141.

At 10:43 AM on 06 Dec 2006,

Matthew Stringer wrote:

I'm not normally one for conspiracies, I don't believe that the Moon landings were faked or that Diana was murdered.

However looking at the various documentaries on the internet regarding the events of that day make compelling viewing.

They make serious and unnerving claims, if any of them are correct then it raises questions that need answering.

142.

At 01:13 PM on 06 Dec 2006,

Paul A. Richardson wrote:

The real news about the 9/11 conspiracy theory is how little attention it receives (or rather: received) in the regular media.

Surely the 5th anniversary would have been a good point in time for news organisations to review and reflect on this disaster.

Based on the amount of information on the internet concerning conspiracies relating to 9/11, I assume that a large enough body of people are having doubts to make it newsworthy.

Whether or not the conspiracies are true is a separate and valid discussion.

Paul.

143.

At 12:35 AM on 07 Dec 2006,

anders wrote:

This isn't simply another crazy conspiracy, at the very least there are very important questions to be answered which have so far haven't been. The head of the biggest families victims groups says most of the families believe it was an inside job, 66% of new yorkers in a recent zogby poll believe the Bush admin had prior knowledge and consciously allowed them to happen, 36% of Americans now actually believe it was a total inside job.

144.

At 01:10 PM on 07 Dec 2006,

Peter wrote:

It would be nice to just a single incident of critical aditute from bbc towards the official US (dis)information they provide concerning 9/11.

We see a total lack of investigative effort. Total lack of critical thinking. Total lack of need to demand evidence for the official story of 9/11.

That is total irresponsibility.

145.

At 11:24 PM on 09 Dec 2006,

warren wrote:

I think that 9/11 goes along well with events such as Operation Northwoods, that thankfully wasn't put into practice. Operation Northwoods was a mock terrorist attack instigated by Cuba in order to have a reason to go to war with Cuba. The government has only benefited from 9/11 by taking away many of our freedoms here in the US. and the fact that just about half of the US believes that something else was going on with 9/11 is a huge warning signal. so please investigate that instead of regurgitating whatever the US government says. since the BBC has no ties with the American Government, they still have the freedom to freely report.

146.

At 02:36 PM on 11 Dec 2006,

Steve, Leeds wrote:

Come on man get a life, do you really think the US would murder 3000 people just for oil?

These con theories sound more like Islamic fascist propaganda.

147.

At 05:55 PM on 11 Dec 2006,

tachik0ma wrote:

"operation gladio", google it, it's totally admitted, it's on the record, it is not a "conspiracy theory". NATO carried out terrorist attacks on their citizens on behalf of West European governments to blame them on extreme communist group in the 80's. Google it, false flags operations are the oldest trick in the book. Do you really think that individuals/groups will conduct terrorist attacks in the open and show clearly that they are responsible without taking retaliation into consideration? And when it gives an excellent opportunity to advance the "victim" own agenda (war in Irak, Afghanistan and domestic Orwellian agenda) doesn't that make you tick ?

This is not Hollywood, this is really life. Get over it and look at it right in the eyes, your belief system might suffer for a while but denying something doesn't make it dissapear.

It's the action-reaction-solution paradigm, you want to implement something that the public would never accept. You create a problem (action: terrorism), this will shift the public opinion into a state of fear and the public will ask for something to be done (reaction) then you come up with your solution (war/police state), which is the objective you wanted to implement in the first place and people will gladly accept it.

Time is running out...

148.

At 07:36 PM on 11 Dec 2006,

Michael legrand wrote:

Are all of the people here really believing what they say? Or being clever? Do they really believe someone who makes President Reagan look intellectual could get away with this conspiracy rubbish.

The BBC is trusted where ever I have worked abroad, in a way that no other broadcasting service is. be careful with it - don't ever lose it. And don't ever sell it to murdoch

149.

At 10:31 PM on 11 Dec 2006,

Ed Schmidt wrote:

I'm saddened that my fellow citizens continue to support the administration's spin on the events of that day.

Just to give you a reality check, what of the thousands of New Yorkers that trusted our leaders regarding air quality, and no need for precautionary measures cleaning up the dust in their homes and at ground zero.

Many will have their lives cut short and quality of life effected by their horrific act.

There have already been people die from the rewriting of the EPA report. It will be years before the true scope of that crime will be realized. The numbers may well surpass the lives lost on 911 by a factor of 10 or more.

It is clear the administration is willing to sacrifice innocents born, and unborn to further their agenda.

150.

At 11:03 AM on 12 Dec 2006,

Paul Stott wrote:

it is interesting how quickly a whole industry has emerged out of 9/11 providing a living for the most fantastic conspiracy theorists.

Quantity however is the name of the game in this research (just look at some of the views

on this thread) rather than quality.

Whilst these theories are strongest in the US (and oddly enough in the Muslim world) there is a small but poisonous 9/11 "Truth" movement in the UK that spends much of its time attempting to "intervene" in other people's campaigns to push their odd theories - these even include the suggestion that there were no planes at all on 9/11!

These jokers are regularly debunked on this website:

<https://www.911cultwatch.org.uk/>

151.

At 03:17 AM on 14 Dec 2006,

Susan Kipping wrote:

Welcome to the New World Order where one is threatend and mocked for questioning an attack of one's own country by what seems to be by one's own government. Which other governments were in on it as well? Why not investigate? Maybe we have more in common than you think.

152.

At 09:43 AM on 16 Dec 2006,

mark wrote:

i would urge people to do there own research on 9/11 and stop hiding from reality. there are obviously people who are scared of truth and avoid or deny the subject, do your own research make up your own minds dont listen to anyone but yourself. people are being manipulated into thinking a certain way because we are all to lazy to get up and find out for ourselves. research find out the facts stop hiding. your future depends on it.

153.

At 01:54 PM on 16 Dec 2006,

mark miller wrote:

something blew me away. check out the comments on the 911 commission report amazon. look at how many people know whats up, i think 80%

mike28 I'm willing to admit I could be wrong with all this conspiracy stuff, Mineta testimony proved Cheney knew a plane was approaching the Pentagon and did nothing. NORAD tapes PROVE the Pentagon lied to the Commission. America was warned of the attacks by Israeli, German, Pakistan and Russian intelligence & Rice warned in both June & Aug 01. Insider trading. WTC7. Too much evidence. Google halifaxion.

That's why a proper investigation is needed but it wont happen while Bush is in power.

154.

At 07:01 PM on 17 Dec 2006,

Rose Dean wrote:

I was so shocked when watching events on television that morning of 9/11.What has been more unbelievable is watching since then the dvd's and documentrys since of a conspiracy.Im hoping someone could answer some questions for me please.Here in NZ if Helen Clarke had done something like this,the opositions like Don Brash Winston Peters to name a few would NOT be letting her get away with it and an investigation would be done so why then has no one in the US goverment ever brought Bush to answer questions on the now known information of events of 9/11 and as its obvious that the 4 planes in question didnt get used for what we have been told happened,where are they and the passengers?I hope these and many other questions will get answered and the person/ persons responsible get brought to account for their actions

155.

At 01:54 PM on 18 Dec 2006,

Gary Scott wrote:

Questions that remain unanswered re 9/11:

1) What REALLY happened to WTC7 that day?

2) What happened to US air defences that caused them to fail so dramatically that morning?

Please, I would love to hear anyone who believes the official story attempt to give me a credible reply on either of these questions.

156.

At **07:07 PM** on 18 Dec 2006,

Jo Blow wrote:

By bringing this issue up and publishing these comments, I'm beginning to get the idea that the BBC regrets their decision to aid in the cover up of 911. It's about time! How many hundreds of thousands of human beings (not to mention animal lives as well as destruction of Earth -depleted uranium bombs anyone?) have been destroyed thus far? Does anyone want to even attempt to imagine? The horror these criminals (the FBI, the bush croonies, the CIA, Saudi princes? Who knows?) have forced onto others is sickening. I applaud the BBC for acknowledging this important issue. But acknowledgment is only the beginning. How about some investigations?

157.

At **02:40 AM** on 23 Dec 2006,

Brian C. Hoff wrote:

First I donot believe that 9-11 was the work of Muslim. It was the worked of Israeli Intelligent agents to get America into murdering muslim around the world. During WWII the Empire State Building was hit by than B-25 bomber carrying than full load of bombs that went off it still standing today. The World Trade Building where not built right it seem.

158.

At **04:32 AM** on 24 Dec 2006,

rob wrote:

One should take note that many of the comments on this thread could have been provided by someone who is employed to do just that, comment on articles relating to 9/11. Sometimes you will notice a comment which starts out rational and agrees that 9/11 was likely an inside job, and then they start talking about lizard people.

Their objective is to discredit the 9/11 Truth Movement.

Some find it difficult to even consider that 9/11 may have been an inside job, much like the wife or husband who sees all the signs that their spouse is having an affair, but lives in denial because they fear what may come to pass if they confront the possibility.

Put down the Kool-Aid and WAKE UP!

Explain to me the implosion of WTC 7 and Silverstein's "Pull It" comments on PBS. You can't! Checkmate!

159.

At **03:02 PM** on 24 Dec 2006,

John CB wrote:

Fascinating to read Rob's comment above. Like most fantasy theories the 9/11 truth movement depends for its existence on the gullible the credulous and the naive. The sort of people that vacuum cleaner salesmen prey on. The JFK assassination is a fascinating case study in how it is possible to construct a nonsense conspiracy theory by misrepresenting the evidence. 9/11 truthers do it all the time. Those of us who can see 9/11 truth as a tasteless farce don't need to discredit it. It does a brilliant job all by itself.

160.

At **03:52 AM** on 27 Dec 2006,

martin killips wrote:

In my experience there are two types of people roaming the world: those that believe in conspiracy theories and realists. The difference is a realist will find a broken eggshell under a tree and look up to see where the nest was. Failing to see a nest he will search the ground near the eggshell for evidence of what took place. A conspiracist, on finding an eggshell beneath a tree, immediately looks for the footprint of the man that must have brought the eggshell to that spot and never thinks to look up.

161.

At 08:54 PM on 27 Dec 2006,

lester wrote:

After months of threads on this page the real truth has still to be found. We in britain have the fabians and orwell, those in the usa have the bilderberg group. The fact remains that there was a conspiracy to destabilise the middle east, the far east, the near east. Why is it that all the intellectuals in the world cannot put two and two together without some form of conspiracy to make it five. There are predators awaiting every war, every attack is therefore bread and jam to someone. Why is it that the human race cannot see beyond the end of its nose. There can only be one monetary power in the world and I personally dont think that BLAIR AND BUSH have enough brains to pull a decent pint never mind a coup of this magnitude.

162.

At 06:09 PM on 28 Dec 2006,

andy wrote:

martin killips,

It's now been addmitted that JFK died in a probable conspiracy, this was confirmed by the house select comitte of assinations.

163.

At 02:43 AM on 29 Dec 2006,

rob wrote:

I find it most interesting that two comments following mine discount the "inside job" theory and any person who believes it. This is a classic example of another kind of "professional comment." They open with insults to anyone who considers anything but the official conspiracy theory attempting to marginalize them right off the bat, yet their comments fall short when it comes to substance. Notice that they didn't even address the WTC 7 implosion or the Silverstein "pull it" comments. (just like the 9/11 Commission) Just insults, no substance. It must be tough being on that side of the truth.

Look at who they put in charge of the 9/11 Commission.

Philip Zelikow, who's area of expertise, in his own words is "the creation and maintenance of 'public myths' or 'public presumptions'". He is a long time Bush crime family loyalist from Houston. He worked for the older Bush and even co-wrote a book with Condolieza Rice. Can you say conflict of interest?????

Rob

Dallas Texas

164.

At 09:46 PM on 08 Jan 2007,

Chris wrote:

Thanks for being honest about this.

In essence, we still know nothing about 9/11 and the the FBI's answer to our doubts about the official claims is "trust your government blindly".

165.

At 02:54 PM on 11 Jan 2007,

Bernard wrote:

Rob #163.

Don't have a bash at the folk who deny the fact that Bush and Company had anything to do with 9/11.

In truth they are helping people who cannot make up their minds as to what happened. As you say, their arguments have no substance. Indeed their arguments have no facts that are based on reality.

So, let the 'debunkers' debunk away. All they can do is help the truth to come out, because they have no argument against it.

The only people who help to hide the truth effectively are the Corporate Media, by only reporting parts of the whole picture.

"Nothing would be what it is, Because everything would be what it isn't. And contrary-wise -what it is, it wouldn't be. And what it wouldn't be, it would. You see?" - Alice in Wonderland.

Bernard.

166.

At 09:13 PM on 11 Jan 2007,

Jean wrote:

Who knows what to believe about what really happened that day? Fact is, I did not like the White House's reaction to what happened. I still do not approve of the way things were handled. There were either some seriously inept people in the White House at the time, or there were some seriously dishonest people there. But let me say again that I do not understand who the attackers were, what the attackers were trying to prove, or what the US government was trying to do or prove in its reaction to the attack. ALSO, I do not know why the US Government invaded Iraq and why the Bush White House wants to stay there so badly. All of this, yes, all of this, makes me believe that, somehow, Washington's hands are not that clean in all this.

167.

At 09:14 PM on 11 Jan 2007,

Roy wrote:

The remarkable feature of almost all of the comments posted on this topic is the wish/request/demand that the BBC initiate a truly impartial and investigative journalistic report into the uncertainties surrounding the 9/11 events.

Has the BBC responded?

Is it likely to react?

Sadly the answer is probably NO, since we all know that they listen more closely to a man and his dog.

Possibly even more closely to the dog itself.

Anybody got the address for Al-Jazeera?

168.

At 12:46 PM on 13 Jan 2007,

mark wrote:

There are too many coincidences between 911 and 7 7 ie lack of supporting evidence, the conducting of a terrorist reaction exercise in the location, the use of the incident to restrict personal freedom and increase police power, its use as a justification for Iraq, the media compliance with the official story, the false accusation of perpetrators. I want to know what we can do next. How do we get justice, how do we hold those responsible or complicit accountable. Are they trying to instigate a revolution?

169.

At 12:18 PM on 14 Jan 2007,

Alexander Crawford wrote:

BBC,

What the BBC editors should consider is how this sort of weird speculation nurtured by yourselves appears to those few Americans whose opinions you actually care about. Cynical and pathetic. For readers who don't appreciate how the BBC is used by the UK government, ignore this post.

Now I'll write this because I hate the CIA even more than I hate Colonialists. The more obnoxious your agitprop, the more annoyed people become who have to listen to it repeated by those who should know better than to pay attention. So here's the bottom line: The Bushies are restraining the faction of Americans who, once set loose, are not going to play nice or care what the newspapers say. The fact that the Russians have already gotten ahead of themselves should warn you that there's grounds to tread softly... but instead there's more of this cheap spin.

You should first quit kidding yourselves about what you think you have on whom. The Janitors don't care. They're lined up for Counter Intelligence like underfed foxhounds, so.... when your CIA contacts start acting jittery and scared, THAT's when you'll know.

Good Night, and Good Luck.

170.

At 12:22 AM on 20 Jan 2007,

Moriae Encomium wrote:

"Our enemies are innovative and resourceful, and so are we. They never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people, and neither do we..."

George W. Bush (speaking for the BBC).

171.

At 03:57 PM on 09 Feb 2007,

christine wrote:

I've just been reading this column and what I see is this.

People keep coming back with more and more facts, on one side, and on the other there are just posts calling them loonies, expressing faith in the US or horror at terrorists.

They are two such different wavelengths that it seems unlikely that they could affect each other's views at all.

I think a constructive approach from the BBC would be a feature on the very interesting story of the janitor, William Rodriguez.

He saved many, many lives, from the very first 9/11 casualty, Felipe David, burnt in the basement explosion to the two people stuck down the flooding liftshaft to the many, many others he released by unlocking the security doors up to the 39th floor.

They are still around to tell the tale thanks to him.

He was the last man out alive and survived the collapse by diving under a fire truck, where he lay under the rubble for 4 and a half hours before he was rescued, thanks to a news camera crew who filmed him running out of the building and pinpointed his location. He survived the choking dust because of a breathing technique he learned in an earlier career as an escapologist! (beats david blaine into a cocked hat;-)

He is a decorated National Hero.

Surely a reasonable BBC project?

172.

At 06:13 PM on 10 Feb 2007,

Seb wrote:

I take it that people are now commenting after the "loose Change" video doing the rounds of Google Video. Link to it: <https://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=7866929448192753501>

Whether you believe it or not it is an interesting point of view and should be considered.

173.

At 10:09 PM on 10 Feb 2007,

richard payne wrote:

i find it disturbing that the world we live in is controlled and manipulated by george w bush. it is a fact that the twin tower tragedy of september 11 2001 was orchestrated by a government that thrives on manipulation.they cause fear which is terrorism at preasant and are clever enough to give us the decision in what to do....vote in an id card on the grounds of terrorism which they created in the first place! as soon as it is law to posess an id card we will lose our freedom completly and the goverment can carry on herding us like sheep but in a dramatic new fasion.....wait and see... or vote against it... the choice is yours... or is it???

174.

At 03:30 PM on 11 Feb 2007,

michael wrote:

good to see other people researching for themselves about what happend on 9/11. It would be good if the news reported the interest on the conspiracy theory behind 9/11 because personally 95% of people i know say the official story doesnt make any sense.

175.

At 09:24 PM on 11 Feb 2007,

john mcilroy wrote:

where is the plane that hit the pentagon building 7 controlled demo this is the biggest cover up since the jfk thing if the BBC has the balls show loose change then see the storm of protest about the cover up .Let the truth be told or let the heavens fall

176.

At 05:19 AM on 12 Feb 2007,

ian wrote:

"The real rulers in Washington are invisible and exercise power from behind the scenes."

Justice Felix Frankfurter

(1882-1965) U.S. Supreme Court Justice

Whats not to believe everytime someone asks a valid question about 9/11 the media goes into a defensive smear campaign.

Fox news called sean penn an enemy of the state for marching with war protestors.

There is clearly a plan by the us for global control.

Hitlers reichstag fire

Bush 9/11

replace communists with terrorists and they are the exact same thing.

It gave both of them right to wage war.

I believe 9/11 was planned years in advance.

177.

At 11:41 AM on 12 Feb 2007,

Gerrit Janssens wrote:

What interests me even more than knowing whether or not there was a conspiracy, is finding out who (i)ndirectly benefits from the confusion and uncertainty around the 9/11 events.

Media, selling news?

Government & co, selling a war?

...

That is something I feel the BBC should tackle.

178.

At 11:53 AM on 12 Feb 2007,

Lee Roy Sanders, Jr. wrote:

Your not asking, your telling the people to discount it in your wording about the topic.

"9/11 conspiracy theory"

It is not a theory. It is a fact. The military do not think like their programed biased public. They are cold blooded. They deal with statistics concerning lives as payment of any achievement.

How else can a world public be biased toward a military's objective in such a short time?

How else can the military introduce more powers above the will of the people?

179.

At 12:00 PM on 12 Feb 2007,

Gerrit Janssens wrote:

Something that I would like to add to my previous comment.

Maybe we, as "the public", benefit from conspiracy theories too in a way, because it makes our governments look powerful and in control again, while we don't want to face the fact that nobody, not even our leaders, can protect us from everyday violence.

Maybe we need the feeling that some people are in control, even if they do harm.

180.

At 05:04 PM on 12 Feb 2007,

GreenMachine wrote:

Fascinating strand - a plea to all (including the BBC's investigative journalists!) to put aside pre-conceived ideas and carry out your own research. Read Mike Ruppert's 'Crossing the Rubicon', Ahmed's 3 titles on International Terrorism, DR Griffin's several texts on the subject and the new book by Peter Lance ' Triple Cross'. After that read the '911 Commission Report', FEMA, NIST, FBI, etc. Only THEN try to come to some conclusion about the 'conspiracy' you believe; the Official version or an Alternative! It would be a massive step forward if the BBC can unearth real evidence, whatever the nature, and air it!

181.

At 11:21 AM on 13 Feb 2007,

georgina morphett wrote:

I am glad to see that 80% of rational people here know what they are talking about. We do not wear tin foil hats or straight jacket, all we are asking for is a PROPER investigation this time. After all how could the 911 commission do a proper job when more money was spent on the Monica Lewinsky trial. Maybe that is why they failed to say what happened to WTC7, what exactly was going on with the war games that morning, and what happened at the Pentagon. The other 20% of people here, really are a bit of an ignorant bunch.

Many people here have quoted some good books and links to films online to help get your head around it, but I know for sure you wont follow them, you would prefer to tell me to look up Popular Mechanics, which indeed I have done, and they really havent answered any of my questions. And the media has failed miserably in reporting on this. Here are a few things to chew on, skeptics feel free to come and 'debunk' me, but do show me proper evidence please. About the planes. Why was there no wreckage from the planes. Why wernt they reported straight away to be deregistered, as should happen within 24 hours of a plane crash, why did only do it a few years ago. Why has the tail number from one of the planes been spotted flying some years after? Why does the FDR/NTSB data not add up, if the official story is true, then it would have been impossible to have knocked down the light poles in the street, equally as impossible as flying a 757 into the Pentagon at ground level, and not leaving a mark on the lawn outside. (I noticed even the 'pilot' couldnt deny that one). Why was it not shot down before it hit the Pentagon anyway, there was plenty of notice.? Why was there a small white plane seen circling over head when

flight 77 hit, when all planes had been grounded? How does a plane made of light aluminium go through steel like that and leave a gaping hole. The plane should have been shredded on impact and blown up outside the building. More random questions, not all relating to aircraft. How did the towers come down, the fires didn't burn for long enough to weaken the steel, that's why there was so much smoke coming from the top, because the fire was going out. How did incompetent hijackers find their way to their destinations, they weren't exactly professionals? Why did George Bush sit like a lemon in a class full of kids, if a real terrorist attack took place, if he didn't know what was going to happen next he would have been out of there and off to save the country? What happened to John O'Neil? Why did the Family members of people who died only get compensation for their loved ones if they never spoke about it? The Jersey girls are still fighting for justice as are many others. What happened to the 2.3 trillion\$ just prior? What happened to the gold that went missing? Why one minute is Osama the most wanted man on Earth, and next, George Bush says he's not important anymore? (maybe because he has already died according to some, kidney trouble in 2002) You know I could go on, but I feel the more I write the less this will be posted, but I could go on, I'm only scratching the surface here. All we want is for the correct people to be blamed for this, JUSTICE.

182.

At 02:53 PM on 13 Feb 2007,

Peter Bassey wrote:

I am stunned beyond words to read this new-fangled conspiracy theory over 9/11. Certainly, it is now clear beyond doubt that people will believe any spin provided the culprit is America.

Use your heads, everyone, just how could any government organize such slaughter of its citizens on such grand scale without engaging hordes of men and women from a number of agencies any one of whom could, and most assuredly would, blab? Think of the idiocy of such a plan when the risks of discovery far outweigh whatever benefits one could ever hope to gain from such madness. Even Americans are cleverer than that.

Please!

183.

At 09:55 PM on 13 Feb 2007,

Winston Smith wrote:

The bigger the lie, the more people will believe it. 9/11 was an inside job and those behind it must be brought to full justice. Anyone willing to watch the footage that is available can determine the truth for themselves. The future of the western world hangs in the balance here.

I hope this new BBC documentary proves to be an example of real investigative journalism and not another typical New World Order white paper. The people are becoming quite adept at seeing through disinformation, think of it as the one positive aspect of a propagandized world. Surely there are still some people of character left in journalism, not to mention in the upper economic classes (ie. those who own and control media, such as BBC Management?) in England and America.

Yes, our western culture is materialistic, amoral, and complacent, but perhaps there are still some people of courage in influential places.

Thanks,  
WS

184.

At 12:12 AM on 14 Feb 2007,

Robert Hendry wrote:

Peter Bassey 182:

## Quote

"Use your heads, everyone, just how could any government organize such slaughter of its citizens on such grand scale"

Well peter, governments have been doing this for millenia and the name for it is Black flag operations. The US has admitted a number of them, Hitlers attack on the Reichstag is fact.

However, after hours and hours of reading on the net I dont think there is any evidence either way but my biggest problem with buying the official line is this:

1. Building 7. It wasnt directly hit, it was barely on fire yet it fell to the ground in what could only be described as a controled demolition. The owner of the building (sorry I forgot his name) goofed in an interview and said "we decided to pull it", a term always used by demolition crews. Later he claimed he meant remove the fire crews.

2. The pentagon video. That looks nothing like a plane hitting the building and the complete lack of any wreckage except for a window frame no bigger than a car door was all there was. Lets not forget the perfect round hole about 30 feet in diamater.

Im still on the fence though and probably always will be until some new evidence comes along. But for sure in a court of law the current evidence simply wouldnt stack up for a conviction.

185.

At 11:53 AM on 14 Feb 2007,

Gary Parsons wrote:

Finally someone mentions Crossing The Rubicon by Michael C.Ruppert. This is the stand out book about 9/11 because it deals in provable facts and not unprovable theories. It contains over 1000 footnotes documenting where every piece of information came from.

Has Mike Ruppert been interviewed for this programme or is just the rantings of Alex Jones again?

If you want to learn more about Mike Ruppert try his website <https://www.fromthewilderness.com>

186.

At 01:58 PM on 14 Feb 2007,

Chris wrote:

Surely the fundamental thing about 911 is the change it has brought to the world. Hundreds of thousands of people are dead as a direct result of policies framed in the aftermath. As such it is surely only reasonable that a full investigation (forget the 911 commission who were a self admitted joke) is forthcoming and that the facts - whatever they may turn out to be - are revealed. If someone can prove to me that 19 guys pulled this off with the help of another guy in a cave then fair enough... but so far there are simply too many unanswered questions and we should not be sending our young people to kill and die without a full explanation of the facts. It is morally bereft of our political leaders and the media that there should be any outstanding issues regarding the single most significant event of the 21st Century. You don't have to subscribe to any theory to want to know the truth... and surely, the truth should be at the forefront of the thinking of the BBC who, after all, should be answerable to no-one but the licence fee payers and not, as seems all too prevalent, the Government.

187.

At 10:27 PM on 14 Feb 2007,

johnniejohnnietriangletopman wrote:

the problem is the following. the planet has 6.5 billion brains capable of the same thinking as tesla and einstein and gandhi. to trick all the 6,5 at the same time is impossible, but you can trick some of them all time. the world is a funny place and the ones pulling the string try to adapt to this fact, probably they adapt very succesfully and the future will

show how they have succeeded. (911, like london 7/7 = inside job by the way.)

188.

At 12:18 AM on 15 Feb 2007,

Neil wrote:

To Peter Bassey

Alot of people have "blabbed".

Top Cia officials, ex government officials, generals, colonels, doctors, professors etc all working directly or indirectly on the aftermath of 9/11.

The problem is that these people will not show up on mainstream as it is controlled by the government.

There is plenty of websites out there including infowars.com, 911truth.org and prisonplanet.com which will give ALOT of information regarding the facts and not the lies of 9/11 and also the build up of it throughout history.

trust me, to my knowledge 4 or 5 years ago I believed what the government said, when I finally clicked on the internet for the first time a whole lot changed.

189.

At 01:19 AM on 15 Feb 2007,

Susan wrote:

There are many facts that have not been investigated. People want answers. Millions of people from around the world know this was an inside job, but what other countries were involved?

On September 11, 2001 Senator Porter Goss, the soon to be US director of the CIA, was having breakfast with Pakistani General Mahmoud Ahmed, who headed Pakistan's intelligence agency, ISI. ISI, according to a Washington Post report, was "notoriously close to Osama bin Laden and the Taliban."

When it was revealed that Mahmoud Ahmad had ordered his aide, Ahmad Umar Sheikh, to wire \$100,000. to "WTC hijacker Mohammed Atta" from Pakistan, and confirmed by the F.B.I., the U.S. sought ISI Director-General Mahmoud Ahmed's removal from his position, but did not investigate or, in any way, try to hold him responsible for his role in the attacks.

Scott Forbes, who worked in the South Tower of the world trade center, witnessed a power-down of the tower in the weekend before 9/11. The whole building was evacuated. No one knows who went in or what they did while there.

George W. Bush's brother, Marvin and his cousin had been in charge of security for both the Twin Towers and the Dulles Airport.

Why, when all the planes were grounded in the US after the attack, did the entire families and friends of the bin Ladens get flown safely out of the country without questions?

Fifteen of the nineteen terrorists were from Saudi Arabia yet we bomb Afghanistan and Iraq. Nine of the nineteen suspects turned up alive yet their pictures remain on the FBI posters.

There is so much information and so much evidence anyone can see the "official story" is a lie. Can we not have the truth?

190.

At 04:26 PM on 15 Feb 2007,

mark d wrote:

I can't believe the BBC actually "correcting" and archived story.  
Outrageous behaviour.

191.

At 06:52 PM on 15 Feb 2007,

andy wrote:

what ever happend to proper journalism ? the BBC will no doubt do what all the other channels have done, ridicule the truth movemnet make out everyones paranoid, trumpet the more outrageous theories ETC ETC ETC.YAWN.

Heres a thought BBC why don't you air 'OIL SMOKE AND MIRRORS' ?????

COWARDS.

192.

At 12:02 AM on 16 Feb 2007,

alan prious wrote:

rewriting history  
it's what we do.

193.

At 07:24 AM on 16 Feb 2007,

John MITCHELL wrote:

John MITCHELL  
Herblay FRANCE

Bonjour ,

This subject is too important to be kept just for the British. When can we the French see it as well ?

We could be on the brink of an American provoked 3rd world war with Iran and we need to get the truth out as quickly as possible.

Will some one please put it on the net so that next week the millions of people in the world who believe it was an inside job can see it as well.

Thanks

John

My own small contribution to the truth can be found at

<https://mouv4x8.club.fr/11Sept01/911Pho01.html>

194.

At 10:25 AM on 16 Feb 2007,

Jamie wrote:

I have very serious doubts about the plausibility of the US government's official 9/11 narrative, as do many of the family members who lost relatives on 9/11. I've simply looked at some of the unanswered questions regarding 9/11 and found the official answers to be severely lacking. For example -

- Why did those responsible systematically fail to intercept a single hijacked airliner on 9/11, despite having standard procedures in place that successfully intercepted 67 stray commercial jets, all within around 20 minutes of going off-course, in the preceding nine months? Given this fact, how was it possible for Flight 77 to fly unhindered for an hour and a half after it was clearly known to be hijacked?
- It has been established that the head of Pakistani intelligence, General Mahmoud Ahmad, ordered \$100,000 to be wired, a week before September 11th, to the lead 9/11 hijacker, Mohamed Atta. Why did Gen Ahmad then meet with top officials in the US

administration in the days leading up to 9/11? Why did he meet the then head of the CIA, George Tenet, on September 9th? And then with the next head of the CIA, Porter Goss, along with Senator Bob Graham, on the morning of 9/11? Why were Goss and Graham then given the task of heading the joint congressional enquiry into 9/11 despite having met with the man who bankrolled the attacks? In light of this, how can the 9/11 Commission Report state, in good faith, that 'ultimately the funding source for the attacks is of little practical importance.' If this funding had come from Iraq do you not think we would all have heard of it by now?

- Since no steel framed building had collapsed because of a fire prior to 9/11, how could 47 storey World Trade Centre 7, which was not hit by an airplane, had only minor fires and was a block away from the 'twin towers', disintegrate in perfect symmetry at near free fall speed. Why does the 600 page official report not mention WTC7 with a single word despite it being the most inexplicable engineering failure in world history? How does this relate to the comments of the owner of the whole WTC complex, Larry Silverstein, who on a PBS documentary appeared to slip up and admit that WTC7 was brought down on 9/11 by a controlled demolition? Since demolition expert Daniel Jowenko has stated categorically that WTC7 was indeed brought down by a controlled demolition, does this not deserve further investigation?

I obviously don't claim to have all the answers myself as to what really happened that terrible day, but there are so many questions still left unanswered that I think it is quite reasonable and rational for anyone to demand further answers. Others who feel the same and are questioning the official 9/11 fable include.

Andreas Von Bülow – Former German Defence Minister

David Schippers – Chief Investigative Officer for the US House of Representatives Judiciary Committee and the head prosecutor for the impeachment of President Clinton

Dr Jeff King - MIT Engineer and Research Scientist

Dr Robert M Bowman – Former director of the US Advanced Space Programs Development (Star Wars) in the Carter and Ford administrations, and former Air Force Lieutenant Colonel

Stanley Hilton – Chief of Staff for Republican Presidential nominee, Bob Dole

Professor Steven E Jones – Professor of physics, Brigham Young University

General Leonid Ivashov – Head of Russian Defence when the attacks occurred

Michael Meacher MP – Former Blair cabinet member

There are of course a lot of nonsense theories regarding 9/11 which anyone could easily debunk, such as hologram planes etc, but I believe my above questions are rational ones to ask and deserve answers.

Coincidentally, apparently Senator Bob Graham appears in the forthcoming BBC documentary on 9/11, so it will be interesting to see if the BBC questions him about his 9/11 breakfast meeting with General Mahmoud Ahmad (detailed above)

I suspect the BBC film will be a white wash, although I hope I'm wrong.

195.

At 05:00 PM on 16 Feb 2007,

BRICK wrote:

How about clearing up why none of the hijackers names appear on the officila manifests of passengers for any of the planes?

196.

At 07:46 PM on 18 Feb 2007,

keith milton wrote:

i hope that when the truth about 9/11 comes out, the bbc, sky and all their newsreaders who have covered up the lies, are charged along with the real forces that carried out those attacks.

197.

At 10:09 PM on 18 Feb 2007,

Steve wrote:

Having watched the programme tonight on BBC, I have to say I'm disgusted with both the lack of evidence presented, and the subjects chosen to present the case for the 'conspiracy theorists'.

To present the case for, we got a 24 year old hoodie and a Texan Radio talk show host. No disrespect, but they couldn't sell ice to a eskimo.

Why wasn't the largest and most popular organisation '9/11 movement for truth' even mentioned?

Worse still, the excellent works of Peter Dale Scott, Dr Steven Jones and a whole host of other phd qualified subjects were totally ignored.

I am quite frankly appalled at the BBC's ignorance of this subject, and at times it was almost laughable as it was upsetting to watch.

Where did BBC assemble this evidence from - alt.stories.conspiracy?

Please, don't insult the intelligence of us 'conspiracy theorists' by throwing such lunatic theories, such as the one about Flight 93 landing. This story (like so many others shown tonight) were just utter tosh, the kind of which no credible conspiracy website would back.

The lack of depth of the programme was just astonishing.

So no evidence exists to support the theories, according to the BBC?

Do me a favour! I'm not going to waste my time posting examples, because well informed users such as 192. has already posted good examples.

It was the duty of the BBC to present a full picture this evening to the general public.

Unfortunately, they barely wetted the canvas, but in time-honoured tradition they did succeed in managing to paint all government sceptics as conspiracy loonies.

Well done, BBC!

198.

At 10:17 PM on 18 Feb 2007,

Dan Ashwick wrote:

Having just watched the Conspiracy Files program on 9/11, I feel moved to write. I have observed the 9/11 conspiracy theories and various movements with interest tempered by a degree of scepticism and an acceptance that to find the 1 truth from a near infinite number of perspectives is a near impossible job.

Nonetheless, I watched this show with interest, glad that the BBC was willing to screen such information. What I saw, almost inevitably, was disappointing. The show, whilst displaying the viewpoints of either show, was produced in such a way as to always give more credos to the views of the conspiracy critics. It spent a long time explaining the psychology of the conspiracy theorists but surely it is not only me who can see that what is placed on these people by the critics can as much apply to the accepted version of the truth as any of the theories. We are told that conspiracy theorists seek comfort by weaving together a few elements of the story into a theory and ignoring the rest of the

evidence. Is this not EXACTLY what the official version of the truth is doing? Does it not also come across as an easy story, so simple.

I also found it interesting that the programme itself seemed to be produced, ultimately, to get across its preferred narrative - that the government/military establishment, made some elementary mistakes, and tut tut to them, but that is the extent of the conspiracy. The sad thing is that the programme was almost certainly produced with this narrative in mind, and in itself, therefore, a vehicle of just another 9/11 theory. For example, at some points, carefully worded but definitive statements are made - one in particular that states that 'When Al-Qaida hijacked the flights' as a beginning of a sentence...what place have definitive statements such as these got in balanced investigative journalism?

Like all mainstream media, the BBC veers between an excellent vehicle of truth and justice, and a biased storyteller. I hope that future programmes will be made and shown which represent better the former of these personas.

199.

At 10:26 PM on 18 Feb 2007,

john wrote:

just watched 911 conspiracy files - shame on the bbc

what about northwoods,pnac,john oneil,hole in third ring of pentagon,wtc 7 -official report says it had a low probability of falling and after 5 years they come up with the same conclusion and the bbc uses this as proof that it wasnt demolished - come on.

ask the real questions before the elite get the world they have always wanted.

200.

At 09:34 AM on 19 Feb 2007,

S Bar wrote:

It's sad to see a once mighty news corporation reduced to official propagandist. The aspects of 911 you covered are the ones most argued about by sceptics themselves. We don't waste too much time on those issues anymore. Far more relevant are insider training (proven), Odigo text message warnings (proven), Bush's perplexing reaction to the news (watch the video), the unseemly removal of evidence to China (illegal to remove evidence from a crime scene in this way), Silverstein's "pull it" comment (on video, undeniable that he said it), mobile calls that wouldn't work (proven, they've only just installed the technology in aircraft to allow mobile calls at altitude), three Israelis arrested for celebrating the crime, and thousands in the weeks following (proven, not denied by the FBI) and so on.

It's not about psychology, inability to deal with a chaotic world, the wish to see order everywhere, security blankets or anything else. It's about the most sinister mass murder not being properly investigated and those questioning the official story being ridiculed, arrested or even killed.

It's heartening though to see propaganda like 911 Conspiracy Files, it prove to us that we are gaining ground and that you are worried.

You should be.

201.

At 03:30 PM on 19 Feb 2007,

Thomas wrote:

BBC's 'Conspiracy Files' on 9/11 can't possibly be a free journalistic enterprise from the BBC, and I will not pounce on the many many good journalists and other employees at the BBC who - just like all the rest of us who have eyes in our head and a brain in our skull AND are not up to protecting the official myth - KNOW that 9/11 was an inside job, but just say this about the broadcast:

Who, in contrast to all the many many intelligent and moderate and sincere 9/11 skeptics, does this broadcast lean on? Answer: 1) The Loose Change-guys, who themselves, like more carefull researchers, have admitted that their documentary is certainly far from flawless. 2) JIM FETZER (!) of all people!! Fetzer has (together with Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds) deliberately tried to wreck the serious academic 9/11 movement by hijacking the ST911 webpage and (there)by associating 9/11 scholars with his bizarre views of "no-planes at the WTC" [but holograms!!] and "space-beams" [as the cause of WTC's collapse] and other, to say the least, illfounded claims and "theories" of 9/11.

Well, why does the BBC "documentary" not try (fx.) theese guys instead:

- 1) David Ray Griffin
- 2) Steven E. Jones
- 3) Kevin Ryan
- 4) Jim Hoffmann (911Research.com)
- 5) Andreas Von Bülow
- 6) Michael Meacher

...and many many other.

Shame on the BBC hitpiece (but not on all employees at the BBC, of whom many are probably feeling very bad about this "documentary").

202.

At 09:00 PM on 19 Feb 2007,

Ruth Seeker wrote:

What about the text messages?

This is an excerpt from an article in the Washinton Post.

Your government issue programme doesn't wash with us. we know what you are up to.

#### Instant Messages To Israel Warned Of WTC Attack

Officials at instant-messaging firm Odigo confirmed today that two employees received text messages warning of an attack on the World Trade Center two hours before terrorists crashed planes into the New York landmarks.

But Alex Diamandis, vice president of sales and marketing, confirmed that workers in Odigo's research and development and international sales office in Israel received a warning from another Odigo user approximately two hours prior to the first attack. (From the Washington Post's Newsbytes)

203.

At 12:00 AM on 20 Feb 2007,

Vanessa wrote:

I'm surprised the BBC aired their 911 conspiracy programme on Sunday. It only appeared to trash those who disbelieve the official story. The trouble is, what if they are right? I'm not convinced the American Govt. would have murdered all those people deliberately BUT I do have difficulty believing that 2 huge buildings designed to withstand being hit by planes collapsed at free fall speed, as if there were no other floors beneath them to halt their progress. The official explanation would have us believe the fire was so intense it melted the steel but a number of scientists are on record as saying this is incorrect....watch '911 Demolitions'. And why were a number of firemen and a TV newsreporter filmed on the day, saying they heard a number of explosions as if bombs had been planted? There are too many questions still to be answered for my liking and someone has to keep asking them. It is not good enough to say "don't upset the relatives" to try and stop people asking questions. Had I been involved I would have expected my family to try and find out the truth in the light of so many discrepancies.

204.

At 12:53 AM on 20 Feb 2007,

Craig Pruess wrote:

comment on Peter Bassey's remarks (Number 182).

Yes, the biggest stumbling block many intelligent folk have in accepting that the US gov't pulled off a caper like 9-11 is that there would have been too many whistleblowers. Right?

The requirement here is to have a better understanding of US secret service black operations -- their methods, goals and past successes.

The media and physical evidence cover-up involved in the JFK shooting involved a whole range of people, and recently released CIA (leaked) papers list FBI, CIA and military all complicit in Kennedy's murder and the ensuing cover-up. Times Magazine bought up the film footage to suppress the glaring fact that Kennedy was shot from the front (not where the "Lone Gunman" was standing!), and there was a very coordinated, sophisticated disinformation campaign to keep "conspiracy" out of the minds of bewildered Americans for many years.

How did they keep such a tight lid on such a heinous crime? Hey, that's what the CIA, NSA and FBI are expert at.

Sound familiar?

205.

At 03:07 AM on 20 Feb 2007,

Stu wrote:

Sorry BBC - the hit piece was so obvious you've just poured fuel on the flames. However this is the real lesson you should learn. The real legacy of the 911 conspiracy is that millions have switched off the mass media and found their window to the world elsewhere. You no longer control my reality!

206.

At 09:13 AM on 20 Feb 2007,

Mark wrote:

Found a great link to someone's hard work of debunking the whole programme.

Check it out and follow all the links-

<https://debunking-bbc.blogspot.com/>

207.

At 09:30 AM on 20 Feb 2007,

merle wrote:

Re the BBC's 911 Yellow Journalism

Remember, truth needs no spin to defend it.

Defenders of the dominant 'official' narrative or orthodoxy tend to:

- avoid factual debate

- smear their opponents

- obfuscate

\_ 'poison the well' of discussion by throwing in obvious fakes and loopy alien/holograph/space beam/crop circle narratives

- stake the 'goat' on the lower reaches to lure discussion away from the bigger game higher up

- Emphasise the blatant nonsense to give media a means to ridicule legitimate enquiry into malfeasance

- sleight of hand directing of attention to peripheral issues

208.

At 01:43 PM on 20 Feb 2007,

gregor aitken wrote:  
Hello Mike Rudin,

May I start by congratulating you on making the perfect BBC documentary. Obviously you had to keep both the people who believe in the inside job happy, cos lets face the facts are overwhelming and yet you also had to keep the powers at be happy by not letting the cat slip from the bag.

and you did it so well.

Who would have thought you would have sat on the fence so well. i have to confess i didn't think you could pull it off but the whole 'there was a conspiracy of covering up the errors that let it happen but only after 911' is genius.

Mr Rudin, i don't know if you are a journalist, documentary maker or what but i have a serious worry about your ability to put forward an argument.

You must have found it incredible as you researched this film to wonder how you will make a film that avoids the truth, ut you did it well.

Mr Rudin you are the Green Grass of the TV world and i would imagine you have made your future very secure with your film.

It's interesting to note just how busy the message boards are about this issue, much more so than any other topic. Mr Rudin you have to realise for most folk we don't need you to tell us what happened, the days of looking to the BBC for our news are well past, sadly we do still need you to legitimise the truth, or even broadcast it occasionally.

but as long as you guys at ivory towers are acting as responsible gatekeepers then i guess we have nothing to fear. You guys would never let so much blood spill onto our hands if there was a suggestion of underhand behaviour by our governments.

So thanks for the thorough investigation into 911 and thank god all those internet rumours are just that, eh.

Sadly the BBC is now a joke, just another broadcaster like Fox or CBS working for the in the communication arm of the military industrial complex.

Your meant to be the fourth estate. you meant keep an eye on the government on behalf of the people, not turn a blind eye and lie to us.

Thank you BBC, Thanks for picking a side and ignoring truth

209.

At 12:56 PM on 21 Feb 2007,

Thomas wrote:

I get so tired of lazy internet junkies claiming to know that 911 was an inside job, when all their 'evidence' boils down to that pathetic hack job of a documentary, *Loose Change*. It is obvious, they themselves have never bothered to do any independent research, swallowing every lie and distortion put forward by the loose minds at *Loose Change*. So who is being brainwashed? I get so tired of hearing how such and such a hijacker is alive, and hear this repeated over and over like a mantra, except that when I check it out, it always seems to be the Father of the hijacker making the claim. They say "Oh yes, he is alive, I spoke with him, he would never do anything bad". And they swallow this like so many spoonfed pups. I also hear, via *Loose Change*, that Osama could never have ordered 9-11, despite the fact that there are at least 3 videotapes of him admitting to approving it. Of course we are told by the genius's of *Loose Change* that in the most well known one, that this isn't really Osama, because Osama is left handed, and this man is eating right handed. Never mind that the custom in Islam is to eat with your right hand, or that there are plenty of photos of Osama writing, using his right hand. Besides, as *Loose Change*

points out, the 'impostor' in the video is wearing a ring, and no good muslim would wear a ring. I suppose they have never bothered to research this either .There are many pictures of Osama, where he is clearly wearing a ring.But hey, why let details like facts get in the way of your story? I could go on with all the lies and deceptions of the loose change con artist, but I just say one thing: Do your own research people! The Loose Changers are laughing at you, all the way to the bank. And if they want to call me brainwashed for not believing them, just remember to include Noam Chomsky amongst the 'brainwashed', cause he doesn't buy their conspiracy theory either.

210.

At 04:20 PM on 24 Feb 2007,

Boris wrote:

"The WTC was demolished by controlled demolition"... lets cast just as skeptical an eye over that idea as the CT nuts do over the official story.

You need to plant explosives suitable to cut the steel supports, so that's remove the concrete shrouding on each support, place charges and re-cover the work and clear up the mess

repeat across something like 150 supports and do that without anyone in crowded office building noticing, then repeat for the other WTC tower and WTC7

Make sure the demolition charges and controlling cords can survive a plane crashing into the tower, and make sure the aircraft crashes in the correct places

Also make sure no charge/demolition cord can be found after the building comes down.  
Likely?

But of course there's the old chestnut of 'no steel framed building has ever collapsed in a fire'

Steel as it is heated begins to lose its mechanical strength to the point at 700-800C it's lost 75% of its strength at 20C so if you have a piece of steel with a safe load rating of 50 tons and it's loaded to 25 tons at 20C , it has a safe loading rate of 12.5 tons at 800C and is still loaded to 25 tons.

Because of their design, the WTC towers were vulnerable to fire because of the floors kept the structure stable and strong.

The exterior and core structures were damaged in the crashes and it was only the floors hanging on that kept the towers from collapsing straight after the impacts, once the fire compromised the strength of the floors, the towers were bound to come down.

However, the steelwork debris from the 2 towers looked like it had been cut in nice 20 foot lengths by explosive charges , however consider this... when the towers were built, the steel work went up in 20 foot sections that were then bolted together.....

But it's easy to come up with a conspiracy theory for any world event when you ignore science and evidence.

211.

At 05:18 PM on 24 Feb 2007,

Tim wrote:

Thomas you do nothing but embarrass yourself with your ramblings.

Professor Bruce Lawrence, head of Duke University's Religious Studies program, considered a leading authority on Osama Bin Laden, has officially gone on the record (19/02/07) saying that he believes the so called "9/11 Confession" tape, released shortly after the attacks, is an outright fake that has been used by US intelligence agencies to deflect attention from "conspiracy theories" about 9/11.

And had you done any research yourself you would find loose change to be more of a perspective summary of events.

Try the following:

[www.911revisited.com](http://www.911revisited.com)

or

<https://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=4026073566596731782>

for a small insight in to the mechanics of that day.

212.

At **08:11 AM** on 21 Mar 2007,

**Jeremy** wrote:

Thomas doesn't read books, he watches Fox and believes everything the BBC says, like when they said they lost all the video of Jayne Standley in front of WTC 7 announcing it had collapsed some 20 minutes before it had.

213.

At **05:22 AM** on 03 Apr 2007,

Bill wrote:

How is any of these things valid. It is completely ridiculous saying the 9/11 attack was an inside job. It feels like this constant ache for people to say how much the government is against us and stupid people make up reasons to believe that the government is out to get us. i.e. when hurricane katrina hit people said it was Bush's fault. Is it not possible a terrorist attack happened? No of course not the government was behind it all. I seriously thought that this was a joke hearing that people believed this was an inside job, and they say it as a fact when it's completely absurd. And those saying this is a war for oil, that statement is completely wrong. And another thing, the war in Iraq has nothing to do with the 9/11 terrorist attack FYI.

214.

At **03:59 AM** on 06 Apr 2007,

**Little Aussie Battler** wrote:

Remember when we all laughed when good ol' boy George W was elected? Stumbling, bumbling, thick as pig shit Texan elected as president. Thought it was gonna be a laugh watching this fool make a complete fool of himself and the American people.....not hard in the 'land of the free'.

Oops! Funny, you don't hear the yanks telling us they're gonna kick someone's arse any more. September 11 was shocking. Unbelievable. We probably will never know the truth. One thing we do know ; The Americans are the most successful practitioners of terrorism. They deliver world's best practice terror. Their actions guarantee many more lives will be lost. We are at the beginning of dark age.

Death, taxes, and man's seemingly unquenchable thirst for the blood of others, no matter what the cause.

We aren't laughing anymore.

215.

At **09:49 AM** on 10 Apr 2007,

**William Resing** wrote:

This guy needs bigger computers.

216.

At **09:53 PM** on 11 Apr 2007,

**Tyler** wrote:

What I find entertaining about conspiracy theories into 9/11 is the claim that fire could not bring down the WTC. In fact steel loses around 50% of its strength when subjected to heat around 650 degrees. Jet fuel burns at around 800 degrees. When you have millions of tons of building above the crash floors it makes complete sense that the weight would

cause structural failure. Conspiracy theorists have yet to bring one piece of solid science to the table and whenever science is applied against their belief they simply put it off as "government" propaganda of sorts. People must realize that a plot as large as what they propose would take tens of thousands of people to not only do the basics of planting evidence but to also work the plan step by step. If scandals like ENRON are so easily exposed then why has no one come forward about 9/11? Answer: Because there is no conspiracy and the people that did cause 9/11 are daily bragging about it... terrorists.

217.

At 09:57 PM on 11 Apr 2007,

Tyler wrote:

One more thing. The world loves to blame America but the second a conflict breaks out and the Un doesent respond the world calls on us. We provide more Aid than any other nation, that is our duty. Let us not forget that half the problems in Africa and the ME are a result of European imperialism and colonization. Dont blame America for the fact that Europe exploited those regions far more than the U.S. has and simply passed the problem off to us. That is why 9/11 happend.

218.

At 10:08 PM on 11 Apr 2007,

Tyler wrote:

Also one more thing to Tim. 9/11 loose change was completely inaccurate. It presents no science and is simply a view point. It provides no solid witnesses to what it claims. Seeing as ignorant as you are let me just explain one thing to debunk one of many of the false facts in 9/11: Loose Change. Building Implosions occur from the ground up.... and on every floor. So why were no explosions going off in the lobby or underneath? Why was the only debris they point out coming from many floors up, which to correct them was simply the frame buckling? You may ask how I know this and it is simply because I have not only seen a building implode but my brother is a well known California architect plus I have done my own study on the evidence. Grow up.

219.

At 04:52 PM on 12 Apr 2007,

alvin wrote:

Who knows who blew up those buildings. Only the people who did it and God can say for sure.

The government story is shaky at best. While you may not like the conspiracist story it's a better clumsy set of lies half truths andthreads and shreds of evidence the same governments used to go after and remain in Iraq. Funny but the same people who can see holes in the conspiracies can't see holes in any of the goverments story.

220.

At 10:13 PM on 17 Apr 2007,

Martin G wrote:

To Bill, Tyler and others of the 'official' persuasion. I also thought like you at this time last year but I have done my own research in the last twelve months. I am certain of one thing, that the 'official' version of the 911 events is not full, thorough, honest or satisfactory; there are so many ommisions and distortions in the offical narrative it is laughable! See DR Griffin's work for yourselves. Even more enlightening is to look into the history and rise of the 'islamist terror movement', the CIA/ISI/MI6 links since 1980's, the FBI's incompetence in tracking/ blocking known extremists since 1990 and the evolution of the 'neo-conservative' wing of the Republican party. This background is, for me, THE most pertinent evidence. It does not help in identifying everyone involved in perpetrating 911, 'War on terror', Iraq etc. but it does convince me that the spin and blatant lying emanating from Washington and London is the worst kind of 'terrorism'! Take the time to read and find out..you will be shocked!

221.

At 06:35 PM on 18 Apr 2007,

Michael wrote:

I would like to draw your attention to what I feel is a deliberate attempt by the BBC to suppress public access to one of the only official main stream media discussions on the subject of 9/11 and the as yet unexplained collapse of 7 World Trade Center (WTC7): BBC World News Head, Richard Porter's blogs entitled "Part of the Conspiracy?" and "Part of the Conspiracy?(2)" have, for the second time in the past two weeks, been removed from public access on the BBC's main Editor's Blogs page (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/theeditors>).

To suggest that these posts no longer merit a listing under the "Being discussed now" section of this page is ridiculous. Clearly, these blogs are among the most active with reader comments outnumbering all other blog comments by a factor of 10 to 1 and postings on these blogs continuing to this day.

The timing of all this is rather suspicious given the fact that ABC Television's popular morning talkshow, THE VIEW, has in recent days been highlighting a number of anomalies relating to the collapse of WTC7. As a result, public curiosity has been stoked and people are beginning to ask serious questions about the facts surrounding this important event.

To date no satisfactory explanation has been given as to the cause of this collapse and I find it extremely worrisome and disheartening to see the BBC, the world's pre-eminent PUBLIC broadcaster, enagaging in what can only be described as media suppression and quite possibly censorship. Removing these open and transparent discussions from public view at their time of greatest need borders on the criminal.

In the interest of free and open public discourse, as befits a public broadcaster, I would encourage the BBC to return the aforementioned blogs and their corresponding reader comments to their rightful place on the "Being discussed now" section of the BBC's Main Editor's Blogs page (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/theeditors>).

222.

At 02:56 PM on 19 Apr 2007,

adil wrote:

Why there is a need to edit archived story? Doesn't it mean that BBC is supporting 9/11 conspiracy? We have seen here in Australia on channel 10 that it was a cargo plain, not passenger plain that hit one of the twin towers, it was clearly visible that something was attached at the bottom of the plane, thta could be only bomb. Most importantly the blast inside the tower was few microseconds before the plane hit the tower. it was the same video in close up that we have seen live during the blast. doesn't it prove anything? The false war on Iraq. US supported massacre of Lebanese people by Israel.US supported forced occupation of Palestine. All this blood shed.... isn't it enough evidence of US's conspiracy who is trying to grip its loosing power on people of East keeping with the view that people from the east still are idiot, uneducated and cannot defend themselves.

223.

At 02:27 PM on 20 Apr 2007,

Erin wrote:

This story and all these comments sadden me. Almost six years later my heart still feels like it is being ripped out by what occurred on 9/11. When I think of the man I saw fall to his knees in the coffee shop when he heard his cousin was in the North Tower, or my friend the preschool teacher running with a shopping cart full of children it still makes me cry. Bush pretending to be John Wayne never comforted me. I have always felt that there were many truths being suppressed. I think what saddens me more than anything is all of the extreme hatred that has been bred since this occurred, even from people who consider themselves "enlightened".

224.

At 11:21 PM on 20 Apr 2007,

Brian wrote:

So, let me get this right!

To try and disprove some conspiracy theories regarding 9/11, you have decided to go back into archived news articles and edit them so that they fit better into today's political climate!

Have you ever read Orwell's 1984?

And you wonder why people have nick named the BBC the Ministry Of Truth.

The BBC is becoming a joke! Only it's not funny!

225.

At 08:28 PM on 23 Apr 2007,

Anwar Rizvi wrote:

I am a Muslim and I am most certainly not a "believe anyone but the Americans" conspiracy theorist.

It is my firm opinion that 9/11 was a result of fanatics bent on causing mayhem in their choice country of hate, made possible only by the incompetence of the US security services and the Bush administration's close links with the Saudis. No conspiracy there.

That there was confusion in the aftermath (not surprising given the magnitude of the event) and possible attempts at cover up (for this read reasons given above) should surprise no one.

I am not going to buy into the "names" argument. It does not prove anything and is just grist for the mill for the conspiracy theory "fanatics".

To me if proof ever was needed, it came directly from the mouth of the man himself: Bin Laden, on more than one occasion has praised the "magnificent 19", hailed them as martyrs and promised many similar attacks. (remember Bali, Madrid, London???)

Also no fanatic worth their salt has ever posted a message on the web without making some reference to the "heroic achievement" of 9/11 and as above praised the murderers as "martyrs".

Ask for the post 9/11 events to be thoroughly investigated, yes of course. Uncover the cover ups and the incompetence for sure. But for God/Allah's sake please get over the fantastic notion that this was some sinister plot hatched up by the FBI/CIA etc. They are too busy fighting their own turf wars to even dream of planning anything as complicated as this.

226.

At 09:52 PM on 23 Apr 2007,

Dan Wells wrote:

"Answer: Because there is no conspiracy and the people that did cause 9/11 are daily bragging about it... terrorists." was a comment above. I'm sorry, but have you heard any terrorist group say 'Yes, I did it, I am bragging that I did it'? No is the answer. Bin Laden said that he didn't do it on Sept. 13th 2001, then the CIA faked a video (badly) saying he did it. Go on the FBI most wanted page, no one including Bin Laden, has been connected with the terrorist atrocities on 9/11. A spokesman for the CIA said: 'there is not sufficient evidence to say Al Qaeda or Bin Laden were behind the attacks'.

227.

At 12:02 AM on 25 Apr 2007,

greg wrote:

At first reading some of the theories put forward sound ridiculous. They are speculating on things that can never be proved even if they were true. However we have numerous

video's of the buildings collapse to analyze and i contend that analysis of this footage, not in unprovable theories, is where the debate should be centered.

i feel the following example explains well the reasoning behind the current controversy over the collapsing of the three buildings

If you imagine the section of the towers above the damage was suspended in mid-air and was dropped, it would fall at free-fall speed to the ground. However both sections of each tower DID fall at free-fall speed and they had 110 floors of undamaged steel mesh and concrete to fall through. Saying that this huge force pushing up on it would not slow it down is simply ridiculous.

In fact, even if the floors that were on fire COMPLETELY melted (which is impossible as hydrocarbon fires reach a max temperature of 600C), the top section would land on the building below and would just topple over due to the law of conservation of momentum.

Even if every floor it fell through slowed it down by just 1 second, that should take 110 seconds, yet it took a startling 9 - 12 seconds.

And I'm not even going into WT7 which remains absolutely impossible to explain, except from controlled demolition.

BBC you need to have this debate on TV as 9/11 is still being used daily as an excuse to diminish everyones civil liberties. The war on terror, The invasion of Afghanistan and The war in Iraq would not have had ANY support from the public without 9/11. The oncoming invasion in Iran would not be happening if it weren't for 9/11 also. I cant help thinking because of the relentless aggressive attitude of America's elite the world is getting drawn into world war three.

There appear to be a very surprising amount of experts now questioning the official version, some of the professors are very highly qualified and i doubt that they have got it wrong.

I really would like to know, giving the severity of the accusations, why the BBC has chosen not to have a serious debate on TV about this. Surely, even if you still refuse to admit any alternate theories are correct, the high number of people who believe these theories should be a top news item in itself.

228.

At 10:16 AM on 25 Apr 2007,

merle wrote:

The BBC seems to have a new love affair with the 'conspiracy' word, which is demeaning for a respectable news disseminator. In the strict sense of the meaning, 'conspire' means 'to breathe together' towards a common goal. In this sense, BBC journalists conspire to get the news out every hour, on the hour; Cricket teams conspire to win; Lovers conspire to orgasm and whisky-drinking Cessna pilots conspire to perform precision aerobatics over Manhattan. Let's get over it. The BBC seems pressed to defend a certain orthodoxy by labelling those who beg to differ as 'conspiracists' in its endless 'conspiracy' blogs.

The BBC needs to fulfil its given function - which I imagine is to impartially investigate and accurately report on current events as well as official malfeasance. The BBC needs urgently to revisit its understanding of the role of the Fourth Estate in modern democracy.

229.

At 11:02 AM on 26 Apr 2007,

merle wrote:

Barely anyone is accusing you of 'conspiracy'. It is you - the BBC Editor - who raises and repeats this word in this context. It seems many BBC viewers are dismayed by the way news items are framed, packaged and delivered by this public broadcaster.

Writes Dr. Daniel Goleman in his book *Vital Lies, Simple Truths* (Bloomsbury) in a chapter headed *The Flow of Information In A Free Society*: 'Points of view ... that don't fit into the

consensual view can be dismissed as eccentricity or aberration. The ease with which (media) can dismiss deviant views - in fact, bury them - suggests that the mechanism for doing so is the aggregate weight of its citizens' shared lacunas. We do not see what we prefer not to, and do not see that we do not see...The truth is replaced by silence, and the silence is a lie.'

230.

At 12:03 AM on 27 Apr 2007,

Cathy K wrote:

I was one of the people who actually believed we were under attack by another country. I now believe, our Govt. knew about it beforehand. Why? Our Govt. had the most to gain. Start a fake war, based on it, get the Patriot Act going to censor and control it's people, and continue to push people around to fulfill its goal. Whether they actually did it or just let it happen is besides the point. Europe is not so clean either. Under the guise of freedom, we have all been imperialistic since the Industrial Age. New markets are always being sort after. First the Europeans took over parts of the world and called it colonialization. How could we further use the poor, ignorant masses to fill the pockets of the aristocrats and industrialists.

Immigration into the US during the 1860-1930's was for lining the pockets of the very rich. Do the current govts. actually care about its citizenry? I think not. Nothing has changed. Wars are being waged in Iraq etc. due to the need for new markets or fuel to keep the MACHINE going. Of course, Bush and the ultra wealthy people of the world use us. They were responsible for millions of people dying. Most of the WASPS who run the US think of the minorities as just visiting anyway.

My only fear now is what area in the US will be Bush's target to destroy, so he can further instill horror into our country in order to further implement his agenda before he leaves office, and is followed by a fellow who can keep the secret going and use the ignorant masses to follow the plan of the New World Order. Whatever name you want to give these group of men who really do run the world, the one name that has to apply is EVIL> Just one thing, I am a parent with a young child. I teach High School. If I am thinking this way, believe me, millions of us ordinary people are.

231.

At 11:38 PM on 17 May 2007,

jim wrote:

Post 230 is an excellent synopsis of the historical and geopolitical perspective that is omitted from the news. This is no accident. For example, we are force fed insubstantial refrains celebrating the idealism of JFK and Reagan. The media never mention the obvious fact that these elitists purposely instilled an unwarranted phobia of the USSR and "communism" in their population in order to justify the construction of weapons and invasions of other countries. So here we are today. The bogeyman USSR collapsed from within without the occurrence of WWIII that we were conditioned to fear. With that menace gone, a second Pearl Harbor/Burning of the Reichstag has plunged us into a Second War on Terror. We are told that this epic war will last indefinitely and must be boundless in scope. I don't know why we're so disappointed with the BBC. Since its inception journalism has been prone to spin the yarns the ruling elites desire.

232.

At 07:48 AM on 22 May 2007,

Duane wrote:

Keep up the good work. The truth movement is global, the walls of deception sit on shaky ground. Just look how many people posting here are never going to be fooled again.

Each of these people I'm sure have told at least a handful of people to see for themselves.

Shine the light on the darkness of the world.

NWO your time is now very limited.

233.

At 12:49 AM on 23 Jun 2007,

mark simmonds wrote:

They say history doesn't repeat itself (14th century), well think again. Now once again its a witch hunt against Muslim people because its the fastest growing faith in the world!

234.

At 03:32 PM on 06 Jul 2007,

safraz wrote:

i just think people of america have had a game played as every1 knows president gorge bush come in to power because of his inside people eg. fox news the only way could be explained is if people dont like you the bst way to win there trust would be to put fear in there heart and thats what he has done clever for short term dum for long term

235.

At 05:08 PM on 06 Jul 2007,

anonymous wrote:

Speaking about theories on the 9/11 here is one; the 9/11 attackers were really guatamalan refugees dressed up and using arabian names. The idea first came to them as they became lost coming across the mexican border some years ago and came across a copy of the actual

details of the Boston Tea Party.

You remember don't you how that went?

Anyway, when Former Mayor Koch insisted on a ban against smokers and litter bugs at the WTC, ...

the rest is history.....

236.

At 07:31 PM on 08 Jul 2007,

Naheed wrote:

9/11 attack was a conspiracy. My mind had not believed it when I had seen the twin towers falling, it all seemed as some explosives had been placed on every floor of the buildings. Can you think that a plane can bring such a destruction that erases the existence of the sky rise buildings? I really can't!

237.

At 10:56 AM on 09 Jul 2007,

merle wrote:

I agree with Comment No. 7 (Henry) which states: 'This column ...seems to be political spin. Real journalism would be to further investigate the issues raised...' Instead of the BBC putting news first and getting down to some half-way decent investigative work around 911, this thread is cast out into the blogosphere to phish for .... what exactly? Foam-flecked, misspelled conspiracy drivel? Our anger at the Fourth Estate's dereliction of duty? These BBC 'Conspiracy' threads have the interactivity of a house brick and do your organisation no credit. Your silence increases frustration and angry verbosity. Perhaps that's what you want.

238.

At 11:59 AM on 20 Jul 2007,

jim wrote:

The evidence is overwhelming and available for anyone to look at-- these days it seems journalism is just turning up at government press conferences and reporting what is said- what happened to the BBC?

239.

At 06:39 PM on 27 Jul 2007,

James Parsons wrote:

I do not think for one minute that George Bush was out of town on that fateful day by any accident. I really think our government agents were aware of the attack and sat back and waited to see what would happen. I really do not think they anticipated the loss of the twin towers....but knew they would be damaged.. James Parsons

240.

At 02:34 AM on 06 Aug 2007,

andrew wrote:

conspiracy theorists think they are smarter than everyone. like they think they know the world is run by a secret evil. well they're all liberal hippies. they use racism like "how could a bunch dumb muslims do this".

the holes in the official story are small. the holes in the conspiracy theorists stories are gigantic.

241.

At 04:48 PM on 06 Aug 2007,

Xie\_Ming wrote:

I understand that WHYS is soon to look at this matter.

Let us hope that some investigative reporting has been done to confirm or refute the six press reports of a white van with explosives and two men arrested on the Jersey approach to a bridge or tunnel on 9/11.

Were these two men among the five illegal Israeli "moving men" arrested that day?

242.

At 03:36 AM on 07 Aug 2007,

Susan Kipping wrote:

We have waited a long time for our leaders and our media to start investigating the events of 9/11. How is it that our Congress and Senate ran out to start a war, strip us of our rights, threaten us, shame us, spy on us, throw in torture, without even questioning or investigating this terrible mass murder on US soil? There is scientific proof of demolition. Witnesses hear explosions before and after the planes hit. Dr. Steven Jones proves that thermite was used. No airplane wreckage at the Pentagon in that small hole, No wreckage in Pennsylvania in that tiny hole, stock buy outs, the mystery of shutting down the towers the weekend before, Porter Goss meets with bagman day of event, building 7 falls for no reason, Bush's brother's and cousin's connection with security at Dulles Airport and Twin Towers, Cheney controlling Norcom (the first time a civilian ever did that), simulated attacks, Air force stand down, evidence destroyed, controllers feedback ignored and destroyed, on and on.

It is obvious that the 2000 election was a coup de'tat and 9/11 was the finally nail in the coffin. Our electoral system is broken and the "war on terror" is a war on us. People need to keep talking, sharing, questioning and soon the truth will be shared by all. The only conspiracy there is is from the people that did this crime and the fact they could get away scott free...for now.

243.

At 09:16 PM on 07 Aug 2007,

Jamie wrote:

Maybe I could say something on the side of those demanding logical explanations to the important questions avoided (including by you BBC) and be called a nutter or I could just rant a lot of vile at those who question the official lie & be on the side of the neocons in the whitehouse (& Downing Street). I think I'll just leave it to those reading these blogs to make their own mind up. A little common sense would soon highlight to the reader who the real nutters in this affair are.

244.

At 10:38 AM on 09 Aug 2007,

Andy Pritchard wrote:

Surely 9/11 is the biggest event in modern times not only politically but also for science, reason and engineering! WHY can't we have a large scale and RATIONAL debate with ALL the facts. WHY can't we have INDEPENDENT analysts investigate the Twin Tower (and WTC7) collapses. If skyscrapers are so likely to explode if there is a fire then shouldn't we stop going inside anything more than 10 stories high? How can engineers ever convince us that they are safe? WTC7 - a 48 story building with minor structural damage and a light fire EXPLODED and collapsed in 7 seconds!!! Surely either a) ALL BUILDINGS OF SUCH HEIGHT ARE UNSAFE or b) THE BUILDING WAS DEMOLISHED WITH EXPLOSIVES - either way this is crucial information and MUST be investigated

245.

At 05:36 AM on 10 Aug 2007,

Susan Kipping wrote:

A correction to my comment of #242 on August 7. Cheney was in command of NORAD on 9/11 not Norcom.

246.

At 09:58 AM on 13 Aug 2007,

mellie wrote:

The vast majority of comments here do NOT accuse the BBC of 'being part of the conspiracy' (sic). May I therefore comment on the BBC's choice of the C-word? I contend that the 'conspiracy' word is loaded. As such, it may be used as a derisive put-down or a shaming word ("conspiracy nut/wacko") and thus as a tool to suppress questions. If information is placed under the 'conspiracy genre' one can dismiss it 'a priori' it would seem.

Yet we have all witnessed the unravelling of the Bush-Blair Iraq WMD 'conspiracy': 'The eventual unravelling of the lie - put out by the White House and amplified by the mainstream media - that Iraq possessed WMD's has increased the knowledge that a powerful network can collude (conspire) in inventing a...worldwide bogus reality.' (Barrie Zwicker, 'Towers Of Deception') Until there is an independent 911 investigation, all theories about 9/11 are conspiracy theories - because either Osama and Nineteen Arabs CONSPIRED to carry it out, or some other agency CONSPIRED to do so.

'The power of this pejorative is that it discounts a theory by attacking the motivations and mental competence of those who advocate the theory. By labelling an explanation of events 'conspiracy theory', evidence and argument are dismissed because they come from a mentally or morally deficient personality, not because they are shown to be incorrect. Calling an explanation of events 'conspiracy theory' means, in effect, we don't like you, and no-one should listen to your explanation.' (Prof Floyd Rudmin, Department of Psychology, University of Torso, Norway)

I now note that one of the Editors Blog threads refers to '911 questions' which I appreciate - as it is a more accurate representation.

247.

At 10:09 PM on 23 Aug 2007,

George W. B. wrote:

Just, why don't you write that "911 was an inside job!" ?

248.

At 05:27 PM on 24 Aug 2007,

john wrote:

911 was an inside job.

The CIA reported on the possibility of a reformed caliphate in the middle east by 2020 in 2004. Its on their official website.

In 1924, the caliphate was destroyed and

over the next 50 years taken apart by several large organisations. The UN security council was set up to make sure that this report never had to be conceptualised. It has failed. Even though an estimated 10 million lives have been cut short in the middle east over the last 50 years.

911, iraq, afghanistan, its all about keeping the region unstable at ANY cost. This isn't conspiracy its raw capitalist common sense.

249.

At 07:19 PM on 25 Aug 2007,

GUY FOX wrote:

9/11 is like having dead rats rotting in the walls of your house. You can't see them, but you know they're there.

250.

At 02:57 AM on 26 Aug 2007,

thomas wrote:

I am a former us army soldier and a career firefighter , I love my country but some things dont add up . The things I was taught in the Army and what I have witnessed dont click for me . I have researched 9/11 and in order to find out what realy happened all you have to do is look at the state of the union befor vietnam and now or if you still dont believe the goverment of this country would do this to us just look back to the civil war . Thank You Thomas.

251.

At 12:49 AM on 28 Aug 2007,

Niels wrote:

Dear Mr Herman,

I'm a bit confused. You now claim that the reports about the hijackers who were still alive was based on common names in the Arab world.

However, the articles at the time reported that not only did these people have the same names, but in many cases they also claimed that their date of birth was used, as well as their photographs.

How many doubles do you have in this world who share your name, date of birth, and who look identical ?

Kind regards,

Niels

252.

At 04:55 PM on 06 Sep 2007,

Ynda wrote:

How can the FBI be confident of the 19 Hijackers when there a) DNA available at the Pentagon crash site but... er... no evidence of a Boeing. b) No DNA recovered from WTC relating to the Hijackers, I understand c) not too sure what was found at the other crash site (is anybody? d) the hijackers had used assumed names and were not on the flight lists (I understand) e) the evidence of the passport "found" at WTC, luggage at Boston and the videos of two of the hijackers boarding at er... the wrong airport(!) all seem laughably planted (cf the fake photo of Lee Harvey Oswald holding a gun). This was all discussed at length by David Ray Giffin's remarkably well written books - at least he provides good sources for his assertions (cf 911 Commission Report).

253.

At 05:20 PM on 07 Sep 2007,

Len Hart wrote:

Looks like pressure was brought to bear on the BBC which probably got it right the first

time 'round. I don't buy the "name confusion" cover story. Other media, as I recall, likewise reported the "resurrection" of hijackers that should have been dead or were reported and/or assumed dead in the official conspiracy theory. I agree with the first comment: no archived story should be rewritten. If you must address a glaring discrepancy or mistake, write another story and own up to it. Don't try to re-write history. It's dishonest.

254.

At 12:45 PM on 11 Sep 2007,

ian coulson wrote:

Not only is the BBC culpable of failing in its public duty to investigate the FBI's bizarrely contradictory statement about the identity of the hijackers. but also, it has throughout acted as a clandestine governmental voice in perpetuating only one view of 9/11: The us/uk governments' distorted, untruthful and incongruous narrative.

255.

At 12:08 AM on 12 Sep 2007,

Sandra wrote:

The truth is fighting its way out of the rubble...

WE WILL NEVER FORGET!

256.

At 03:11 PM on 13 Sep 2007,

Ynda wrote:

I'd love to see some of the evidence for these Hijackers actually come to a court of law and get cross examined: like the passport of one of the hijackers being found in the rubble of the twin towers... Like there was nothing left of the whole aircraft but a sole passport, of one of the hijackers, no less, was found intact!?

Apparently there is DNA of the hijackers of the aircraft that hit the pentagon. Although there was precious little human remains in the building and actually nothing surviving of the aircraft. But they could identify DNA?!

How about the video footage of the hijackers boarding the plane (from the wrong airport) or the left luggage in the car park - none of it makes any sense...

257.

At 11:02 PM on 13 Sep 2007,

jonathan spratt wrote:

Mr Herrmann

Mr Herrmann

The comments on the news editors blogs are subject to the same editorial standards as broadcast news...(BBC editorial guidelines)

Again, how does BBC explain that people share the same name, DOB & photo?

Again, how did BBC preemptively report 6s symmetrical vertical collapse of security reinforced canary wharf size building into its own footprint leaving all buildings across street unscathed & then explain it? (no official explanation yet given...)

I look forward into hearing the outcome of BBC ECU extraordinary meeting in early Sept on 911 reporting complaints in early October...

258.

At 10:35 AM on 14 Sep 2007,

Ynda wrote:

How did the FBI identify the hijackers so quickly anyhow? I've been told (is it true?) that the hijackers names were not on the aircraft passenger list (reasonably predictably) and

there was precious little remains of the 4 aircraft to identify anything. Indeed were the black boxes ever found?

259.

At 09:44 AM on 16 Sep 2007,

Nick wrote:

9/11 was an inside job! It shows! I mean was it just a coincidence that this happened on '9/11', the same number as our emergency response number!? No, I think it was all intentional. Our government is a hijacked mockery that distorts the true image of the American people!

260.

At 11:29 PM on 03 Oct 2007,

Heather Grantham wrote:

I sincerely hope this editing was not borne out of either implied, perceived or direct external pressure. Please don't tell me the BBC is about to go the way of the gagged American media.

261.

At 02:11 AM on 04 Oct 2007,

Murph wrote:

The black box was recovered from Flight 93, and played (in private) for the family members. Transcripts are available.

That so many people could believe something as ridiculous as 9/11 being an inside job frankly terrifies me. Why did we develop the internet, except to avoid paranoid miscommunication and lies? We all watched those planes hit, and we saw those buildings crumble.

It seems as though, just as always, people believe what they want to believe. Not what is credible, or logical.

Ultimately, there was no motive. The attacks on September Eleventh actually delayed the invasion of Iraq, which had been scheduled for March of 2003. The UN Mandate of 1990 was still in place, so any troop incursion was going to be wholly legal.

And a car-bomb in Washington would have been excuse enough, and would have been a hell of a lot easier to organise....

262.

At 06:48 PM on 04 Oct 2007,

Susan Kipping wrote:

The evidence is there.

The facts are: no commercial plane hit the pentagon, no plane crashed in Pennsylvania, and three high rises were demolished in New York. 9/11 was a skillful and well thought out attack.

There is a reason Bush's administration did not want this investigated. Many corrupt people planned and pulled off the attack on 9/11. I want the truth to be told and those who took part be fully held accountable. Millions of people around the world know that this was a black flag operation.

263.

At 07:31 PM on 04 Oct 2007,

leister wrote:

The media is the propoganda machine for the politicians who censor us in everything we do. If god is omnipotent and everywhere and in all things, the nwo governments have made him redundant.

264.

At 07:34 PM on 04 Oct 2007,

Jamie wrote:

Murph (261) - Yeah, totally agree, who would ever have wanted a "new pearl harbour" event to happen to the U.S.A? Also, in spite of nothing to link Saddam with Osama's friends & no w.m.d's other than in the mind of the security services, like you, I'm sure Bush & Blair would have continued to receive our full support throughout this debacle.

I blame the French, Germans etc. for not realising this was "wholly legal" & for the good of the Iraqi people. What's a little illegal detention, torture, genocide etc. if we can make Iraq free for Blackwater, Haliburton, et al. Iraq can count itself lucky it had oil & a strategic geographic position or it could have been left to rot.

265.

At 12:12 PM on 05 Oct 2007,

merle wrote:

Murph #261 - You say people 'believe what they want to believe. Not what is credible or logical'. May I exempt myself from your sweeping statement?

For me, what's 'credible' is linked with courts of law, forensic evidence, due process, transparency and independent investigation. (All of which has been missing around the events of 911 as far as I can see).

'Logical' is linked with scientific method and verifiable, painstaking research - typified by Paul Thompson's 'The Terror Timeline: Week By Week, Hour By Hour, Minute by Minute', for example.

266.

At 02:56 PM on 05 Oct 2007,

merle wrote:

Murph #261 - You say people 'believe what they want to believe. Not what is credible or logical'. May I exempt myself from your sweeping statement?

For me, 'credible' is linked with courts of law, forensic evidence, due process, transparency and meticulous, independent investigation. (All of which has been missing around the on-the-ground events of 911, by the way)

'Logical' is linked with scientific method and painstaking research like Paul Thompson's 'The Terror Timeline: Week By Week, Hour By Hour, Minute by Minute'.

267.

At 03:00 PM on 07 Oct 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Ah, Murph, no 261, yes, the concept of 9/11 being an inside job is terrifying! I don't want to believe it either! Just give me some facts, not what we would like to believe. FACTS. You are doing exactly what you said: believing what you want to believe!

Car Bomb in Washington? Sorry not enough "Shock and Awe". The US administration have stated ambitions in the middle east - it is on the public record! Research Peter Zelikow - he imagined a scenario of what would happen if the 1993 WTC bomb actually succeeded (toppling WTC1 into WTC2). The conclusion: they needed a New Pearl Harbor! The US have had plans to kill their own citizens on many previous occasions: start of Vietnam, Northwood plan for Cuba, LSD trials in 1950s etc.

Wind forward: Bush will always have plausible deny-ability but explain how so many people knew about 9/11 before it happened? Why the Bush administration stonewalled and then white-washed the investigation (lead by er... Peter Zelikow!)? Covered up the links between CIA and Al Qeada? Relatives of the victims are not satisfied (see 9/11 Press for Truth made by the "Jersey Girls").

I'm glad you mentioned the Black Box that was recovered from Flight 93. Now usually with aircraft crashes, the tapes are played and the flight simulated - and shown on TV. But with

Flight 93, we have a transcript... Hmm hardly the most infallible evidence. Not exactly tamper-proof! Could it be that this is an occasion where we won't agree on the basic facts: Official story: plane crashed at 10.03. Independent seismic data puts the time of crash at 10.06. Why this difference? Investigate and draw your own conclusion.

In summary, give me some independent investigations, debates and FACTS! Not a story from a dodgey politician!

268.

At 01:23 PM on 08 Oct 2007,

john dugen wrote:

The BBC has been doctoring news for years. The earliest case I know of was during the miners strike in the early 80's. Video of a confrontation between picketing miners and the police was deliberately altered to insinuate that the miners attacked the police and the police 'protected' themselves (with much gusto).

Ever since that incident I have never believed a word they say. How about the BBC reporting the collapse of WTC7 half an hour before the fact? (And that the feed was immediately 'pulled' even though the standing building could be clearly seen behind the reporters head?)

269.

At 10:02 AM on 09 Oct 2007,

merle wrote:

Ynda #264

Just for correction - executive director of the 911 Commission was Philip Zelikow (not Peter). Zelikow has close ties to the Bush White House. He served in National Security with Condi Rice and co-authored a book with her. DR Griffin - in his book "The 911 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions" makes the case that Zelikow was far from 'independent'. He also shows how Zelikow accepted the Bush administration 'Osama and Nineteen Arabs' theory A PRIORI and worked backwards to prove it.

'Zelikow decided which topics were worth looking into and which were not,' notes Griffin. 'Essentially, the White House was investigating itself.'

270.

At 10:12 PM on 09 Oct 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Hi Merle, Oops yes PHILIP Zelikow. How silly of me to get that wrong.

I think Philip found favour with Bush administration because he co-authored an article in 1998 entitled "Catastrophic Terrorism," in which he speculated that if the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center had succeeded, "the resulting horror and chaos would have exceeded our ability to describe it... (it would)... undermine America's fundamental sense of security... Like Pearl Harbor, the event would divide our past and future into a before and after. The United States might respond with draconian measures scaling back civil liberties, allowing wider surveillance of citizens, detention of suspects and use of deadly force."

Oh and Philip Zelikow served on President Bush's "transition team" in 2000-2001.

After Bush took office, Zelikow had a position on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board before taking over the 9/11 Commission. So indeed, not exactly taking an independent view of 9/11...

271.

At 09:49 AM on 11 Oct 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Hi Merle, Thanks for the correction. Yes, Philip Zelikow. Before being part of the "transition" team for Bush's 2000 elections, he also undertook an analysis of the 1993

WTC bombing and considered what would be the effect on the population if the bombing succeeded. The bombers were attempting to topple WTC1 onto WTC2.

272.

At 09:37 AM on 14 Oct 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Hi Merle, #269, I have been trying to acknowledge your comment for several days now, but the bbc servers do not seem to be able to accept my comments or when the bbc servers do accept my comments that do not appear. I am not too sure whether the comments not being published is due to "cock-up" or "conspiracy" but I do feel as though the bbc does not want to deal with the issues raised.

273.

At 06:25 PM on 14 Oct 2007,

merle wrote:

On 27 October 2006, one Henry Edward Hardy wrote: "This column is really most unsatisfying. It seems to be political spin. Real journalism would be to further investigate the issues raised."

One year later, I find no better comment to make than to echo Henry Edward Hardy's words, posted at #7 a year ago. Isn't this a first - a thread that trails for a year?

274.

At 10:30 AM on 16 Oct 2007,

merle wrote:

Names of hijackers is but one curious anomaly of '911'. Post-911 there was other 'tweaking' of the truth - the Jessica Lynch dramatic narrative being one such tweak - swallowed whole and regurgitated by the press. Slowly, slowly, journalists of integrity are stepping forward to speak out in the face of official obfuscation. American journalist Susan Faludi writes in Time magazine this week (in an article entitled 'Myths of 911'):

"No, I'm not... (too happy with the media's role). I'm disturbed by how much my own profession played a role in propping up this mess. I want to believe that there are other people in the media, as well, who look back with a combination of horror and embarrassment and a desire to redo some of the things they said."

275.

At 10:09 PM on 16 Oct 2007,

wendy wrote:

i wanted to check out BBC'S viewpoint on 911, since i thought it was free of political leniency and biased. i was told by family and close friends that i was leaning too far into "conspiracy theory" i wasn't. i will not go so far as explaining my every belief about the tragedy. i will state one thing. after reading BBC'S view/ news reports about 9/11, and some views/reports on the pentagon. i am more convinced to believe "conspiracy" more than i have ever been. you're news reports are sketchy, unreal, and unfortunately seemingly-so...biased. it was suggested to me to come to this news site because of your supposed sheer knowledge of the tragedy.

i come to find that BBC no longer has footage of the tragedy???

you are correcting your statements left and right????

it is unbelievable.

what does BBC owe america?

why is BBC surrendering their concrete evidence for "i guess" statements.BBC, if you could be any more doubting about the tragedy you once knew much about...it's so suspicious. i never thought...i just never would have thought.

276.

At 07:42 PM on 19 Oct 2007,

Ynda wrote:

So how did the FBI identify the hijackers? There must be a story here. 19 people identified so quickly - surely the hijackers didn't use their own names to board? Assumed identities?

What identifies? How did they get them? How were they tracked down? How did the FBI get it right first time? What about the BBC story? None of this seems to be explained.... Shouldn't the BBC finish the investigation they started in September 2001?

277.

At 03:52 AM on 29 Oct 2007,

ross wilson wrote:

this is all nonsense, theres a easy way to solve this little puzzle of the so called hijackers being alive or not, simply send a team out to talk to these people who the us government say committed these actions and find out once and for all if these people are alive or not simple as...but guess what the BBC wont because they have their orders to stop digging and accept the official story.

yet these so called hijackers dont appear on any of the boarding manifests.

did they get paul daniels to magic them onto the plane?

get real .... BBC get a grip do your jobs theres a lot of hard evidence showing this is nothing more than smoke getting blown up our backsides and yet the BBC dont investigate properly and just call everyone that disagrees with the official story conspiracy nuts.

278.

At 11:56 AM on 02 Nov 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Shades of the "Ministry of Truth"? Is it 1984 all over again? Orwell's book was suppose to warn us of the future not taken as a blueprint!

279.

At 04:24 PM on 04 Nov 2007,

Pat Stickler wrote:

The problem is the BBC is part of it in some way therefore of course they are going to conclude that we should accept the 'official' story. They failed to even mention the strong evidence against the U.S government in their report, just all the obviously false gossip. For example they left out the fact that the BBC reported the collapse of the WTC 7 building 20 minutes before it actually went down, and why it collapsed is still a mystery. Perhaps it had demolition charges?

280.

At 12:52 AM on 10 Nov 2007,

Ynda wrote:

How about having an interview with "Gail Jawahir" who, according to the 9/11 Commission Report is the last living person to see the hijackers of Flight 175 alive. Now surely that is noteworthy. The last person to see these hijackers alive? The person that identified the hijackers. Surely there would be TV crews queuing up to interview... perhaps newspaper stories? Magazines? Discussion with family members?

Er... no. Gail Jawahir has not done any such thing. Just one interview with the FBI in September 2001. No discussion with family members. Nobody has written a thing about Gail Jawahir except for that one... one... private interview. In the whole of Gail Jawahir's life... Not anything. Not a sausage. Nothing. It's almost like the person that identified the hijackers only exists in the 9/11 Commission Report...

Strangely if you google the name, you get many hits. Click onto the second page though. And the many hits reduce down to just 19. (Even I have more hits than that)!

281.

At 04:02 AM on 26 Nov 2007,

Alison wrote:

This is the most sickening revisionism. What has happened to investigative journalism? Instead of standing by your original story, and ferreting out the inconsistencies the later

information presents with it, you revise your original story after the fact to conform to the "official" version of the U.S. government.

The 9/11 Commission report has been widely criticized and debunked.

So much for the integrity and impartiality of BBC News.

282.

At 01:51 PM on 26 Nov 2007,

Dave Robertson wrote:

Debunked? Why has it been debunked? By who ? A few internet bloggers ?

Why cant you accept those planes were hijacked by extremists hell bent on returning us to the dark ages.

There is no EVIDENCE of any worth that points to any other conclusion.

I have said it over and over – The rank incompetency of current Washington administration has been shown time and time again. It's a shambles. Iraq is a shambles. Sub Prime mortgages are a shambles – and I am expected to believe that these "officials" could plan and execute a conspiracy to bring down the twin towers and blame it on the Arabs ? Well I don't.

This is an insult to the people who lost their lives at the hands of these terrorists – you should be ashamed and to accuse the BBC of duplicity is almost as bad.

Accept the truth as it is – murdering extremists – case closed.

283.

At 04:19 PM on 26 Nov 2007,

gregor aitken wrote:

David Robertson you seem quite passionate in your beliefs.

A book by David Ray Griffen debunks the 911 commission report i would recommend you reading it.

There is plenty of evidence that hijackers were not the lone gunmen we are to believe them to be, and even more that the twin towers did fall by plane alone.

As for saying Iraq is a shambles, From where i am standing Iraq seems to be going exactly to plan, mass chaos on the streets, permanent US bases being built and New Western control of the Oil derricks,

The real insult to the people who lost their lives on 911 is that the debate about the day suppressed and please remember there would have been no Commission report at all if it had not been for the families of the victims and it is the same families that are at the core of the 911 truth movement.

I am sad to say that i feel the BBC is guilty of duplicity and possibly complicity in the actions of the day and subsequent days since.

'Liquid bombs on planes anyone'

So Dave Robertson please accept this truth - the case is not closed - the murdering extremists have not been caught , yet.

284.

At 05:54 PM on 26 Nov 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Er... Dave,

The 911 Commission report has been widely debunked. For example by the relatives of the victims of 9/11 (See 9/11 Press for Truth movie - its very good - sticks solely to politics and follows the money).

Also there are ex-911 Commission Report officials that debunk it and loads of scientists, architects, engineers etc. Yes it is only discussed on the internet and not the main stream media. Why are you so keen to close a case which is so obviously flapping around so untidily?

285.

At 11:10 AM on 27 Nov 2007,

frasay wrote:

Dave Robertson,

The 9-11 commission report has been dunked by the chair and co chair of the 9-11 commission itself. Is that a credible enough source for you? Hamilton and Keen wrote a book saying everything the Pentagon told them was lies, and they thought about filing perjury charges. Also worth pointing out that the commission report doesn't mention building 7 at all, not once.

You'd know that if you'd done a bit of research instead of believing everything you're told. I know it's convenient to believe what you're told Dave. Only problem is, the war on terror has been constructed on a series of lies, and now we're torturing and murduring a lot of innocent people because of the lies.

1 million dead Iraqi's Dave. How does that compare to under 3000 Americans, in your book?

Don't be the last person to wake up Dave.

Did you ever consider that the current disaster in Iraq was part of the plan? If US really wanted to stabilise Iraq, then why did Bremner and co steal 23 billion in reconstruction funds? Why has the US administration consistently gone against strategic advice?

If 9-11 was a failure of gross incompetency, why was noone fired? All the heads of departments seemed to get promoted. Why was the most important event in decades not properly investigated?

Do you're own research, Paul Thompson's timeline is an excellent place to start.

Saying "murdering extremists-case closed" is not going to win you any case, in any court, on any planet.

286.

At 12:20 PM on 27 Nov 2007,

buddy wrote:

What the media has told us to believe.

Islamic extreamists flattened 3 buildings using 2 planes.

Osama bin Laden lives in a cave and master minded the biggest media event ever without the U.S.A getting a snif of anything dogy going on(remember osama was their prime suspect Why?)

No it was saddam who was responsible for the 2 planes that flattened 3 buildings.(Suspect number 2 much easier for him to be involved because he had more of a reason,what was the reason?)

Sadam has weapons of mass destruction.

(If he had why did use planes since he had weapons of MASS DESTRUCTION wooh.)

Sadam does not have weapons of mass destruction.

(No he has lots of Oil.)

Why was this programme only shown in the U.K region.

287.

At 02:50 PM on 27 Nov 2007,

Cams wrote:

Take a step back Dave R and you may just see the bigger picture. This is not about the US nor PNAC nor anything else related to the US. This is about the New World Order. Gordon Brown, Starkozy, Bush 1 & 2, Kissinger, Clinton(s), Nixon, Prince Phillip, Gore, Mandela, Jacques Cousteau, Pope John Paul II, Gorbachev, Putin, Rockefeller(s) etc, etc have all called for the world to be 'united' as one or indeed for the earth's population to be reduced.

Some 9/11 truthers may be surprised to learn that D Ray Griffin is a self confessed globalist too.

We are all in this together. Try researching the Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberg group. Otherwise you may as well volunteer to be micro-chipped. Good luck in the North American Union where you will be trading in Ameros.

"NAFTA is a major stepping stone to the New World Order." Henry Kissinger

288.

At 10:35 AM on 28 Nov 2007,

Ynda wrote:

Cams, I can't find the link between Council on Foreign relations et al, and 9/11. There are dozens and dozens of organisations, clubs and think tanks in every country where the rich and politicians mix. This is not by itself strange or spooky.

The EVIDENCE (as Dave R puts it and wants) can be found "9/11 Press for Truth" - made by the relatives of the victims of 9/11. If somehow Dave R thinks he knows more about 9/11 than them, then we would have no hope of persuading him in any direction.

289.

At 07:48 AM on 29 Nov 2007,

Susan Kipping wrote:

I agree with Cams #285.

The United States of America is not run by the American people. It is not a democracy. Democracy is an illusion that millions of Americans believe to be true.

The United States is being controlled by people not only within America, but from numerous foreign countries. Follow the old money.

It has to do with banking (money), drugs, guns and oil. Look into the Federal Reserve. Look who controlled the World Trade Centers. Who built the Twin Towers? Who leased all the buildings? Who was paid off by insurance companies after the collapse of those buildings?

You will find the Federal Reserve (that had gold missing) as well as Peter Peterson Chairman of both the Federal Reserve and the Council for Foreign Relations at the time of 9/11.

On 9/11 Peter G. Peterson was Chairman of the Blackstone Group, an investment-banking firm that was one of WTC 7's leaseholders along with Bank of American Securities and the General Motors Acceptance Corporation.

Who controlled security of the Twin Towers? Bush's brother Marvin (and he did security for Dulles Airport.) What about the power down the weekend before 9/11, the first time they ever had one?

9-11 was handled by very powerful men that are hidden behind great wealth and secrecy. They are in every section of our government and society. Secrecy is key and always has been. It is called the Quiet War. It is a domestic war in America, but it is global.

9-11 was a black flag operation. It will not end there if we do not stop it now. It is better to question and investigate now than later because it will happen again.

290.

At 11:09 AM on 30 Nov 2007,  
mallee wrote:

The AAP interview with Dylan Avery on the "Loose Change, Final Cut" was uplifting. To think that a 23 year old can out do all our Western politicians and BBC investigative journalist on the 911 matter is enlightening for the future of the world. Go young people the world is a matter for you.

BBC, why do you not broadcast the interview, have a problem with being disclosed as idiots do we?

Mallee

**This post is closed to new comments.**

## More from this blog...

Topical posts on this blog	Archives	Categories	Late
<a href="#">The Great British class calculator</a> (14) <a href="#">iPhone and iPad app update</a> (42) <a href="#">School Report News Day 2013</a> (7) <a href="#">BBC Arabic and the complexities of the Arab world</a> (18) <a href="#">BBC World News moves to Broadcasting House</a> (33) <a href="#">BBC News comes to Burma</a> (9) <a href="#">Expanded distribution in the US for BBC World News</a> (17) <a href="#">Mozilla Festival and the fellowship announcement</a> (11) <a href="#">Election stats - new mobile record</a> (8) <a href="#">Election night</a> (39)	<b>Past twelve months</b> <a href="#">April 2013</a> (3) <a href="#">March 2013</a> (1) <a href="#">February 2013</a> (1) <a href="#">January 2013</a> (1) <a href="#">December 2012</a> (3) <a href="#">November 2012</a> (3) <a href="#">October 2012</a> (5) <a href="#">September 2012</a> (2) <a href="#">August 2012</a> (3) <a href="#">July 2012</a> (5) <a href="#">June 2012</a> (7) <a href="#">May 2012</a> (4) <a href="#">complete archive</a>	These are some of the popular topics this blog covers.  <a href="#">1xtra</a> <a href="#">asian</a> <a href="#">network</a> <a href="#">bbc</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">bbc</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">channel</a> <a href="#">bbc</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">website</a> <a href="#">bbc</a> <a href="#">parliament</a> <a href="#">bbc</a> <a href="#">world</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">breakfast</a> <a href="#">broadcasting</a> <a href="#">house</a> <a href="#">click</a> <a href="#">college</a> <a href="#">of</a> <a href="#">journalism</a> <a href="#">credit</a> <a href="#">crunch</a> <a href="#">daily</a> <a href="#">politics</a> <a href="#">ipm</a> <a href="#">nations</a> <a href="#">and</a> <a href="#">regions</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">editors</a> <a href="#">newsnight</a> <a href="#">newsnight</a> <a href="#">scotland</a> <a href="#">newsround</a> <a href="#">one</a> <a href="#">o'clock</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">panorama</a> <a href="#">pm</a> <a href="#">politics</a> <a href="#">show</a> <a href="#">question</a> <a href="#">time</a> <a href="#">radio</a> <a href="#">1</a> <a href="#">radio</a> <a href="#">five</a> <a href="#">live</a> <a href="#">radio</a> <a href="#">scotland</a> <a href="#">six</a> <a href="#">o'clock</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">storyfix</a> <a href="#">ten</a> <a href="#">o'clock</a> <a href="#">news</a> <a href="#">the</a> <a href="#">andrew</a> <a href="#">marr</a> <a href="#">show</a> <a href="#">the</a> <a href="#">world</a> <a href="#">at</a> <a href="#">one</a> <a href="#">the</a> <a href="#">world</a> <a href="#">this</a> <a href="#">weekend</a> <a href="#">today</a> <a href="#">weather</a> <a href="#">working</a> <a href="#">lunch</a> <a href="#">world</a> <a href="#">service</a> <a href="#">world</a> <a href="#">tonight</a> <a href="#">young</a> <a href="#">voters</a> <a href="#">question</a> <a href="#">time</a>	<a href="#">Host</a> <a href="#">Steve</a> <a href="#">Richa</a> <a href="#">Kevir</a> <a href="#">Peter</a> <a href="#">Peter</a> <a href="#">Alistair</a> <a href="#">Jon V</a> <a href="#">Helen</a> <a href="#">Andrea</a>



**BBC © 2014** The BBC is not responsible for the content of external sites. [Read more](#).

[Mobile site](#)

[Terms of Use](#)  
[Privacy](#)  
[Cookies](#)